

GENERAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
VOLUME XXX¹

JAN 1 1935

NUMBER 1

January 1935

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A *Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

EDITORS
CHARLES HENRY BEESON, *Managing Editor*
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
JAKOB A. O. LARSEN
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CAMPBELL BONNER, *University of Michigan*
GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN, *University of California*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*
FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
KENNETH SCOTT, *Western Reserve University*

VOL. XXX

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1935

No. 1

A New Dating of Horace's <i>De Arte Poetica</i>	By Jefferson Elmore	1
The Image in the Sand	By Joseph William Hewitt	10
Rome's Battles with Etruscans and Gauls in 284-282 B.C.	By E. T. Salmon	23
The Place of the Dog in Superstition as Revealed in Latin Literature	By Eli Edward Burris	32
The Development of Plautus' Art	By John N. Hough	43
The Pseudo-Marius	By Albert Earl Pappano	58
Notes and Discussions		66
J. ENOCH POWELL: Notes on the <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> .—JOSEPH H. DRAKE, SR.: <i>Again Hoc Age</i> (Plautus <i>Captivi</i> 44).—HOWARD COMPTON: The Date of Catullus LIII.—L. ROBERT LIND: Vergil's Military Experience.—L. ROBERT LIND: A Note on Nonnos' <i>Dionysiaca</i> i. 69-71.—A. D. FRASER: <i>HANTHEPTATH ΗΠΟΣ ΖΩΩΝ</i> .		
Book Reviews		80
HERBERT NEBBELHAUF: <i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie</i> (West).—DAVID M. ROBINSON: <i>Excavations at Olynthus</i> , Part VI: "The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931" (Bellinger).—ROBERT J. BONNER: <i>Aspects of Athenian Democracy</i> (West).—WERNER SCHUR: <i>Salust als Historiker</i> (Carter).—P. REIS: <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manusunt omnia</i> (Beeson).—A. Y. CAMPBELL (ed.): <i>Horatii Carmina</i> (Haight).—WOLFGANG SCHADEWALDT: <i>Die Niobe des Aischylos</i> (O'Neill).—ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER: <i>Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry</i> (H. W. P.).—GUSTAV MEYER (ed.): <i>Edward Walford: Ausgewählte Schriften</i> (Beeson).—R. S. CONWAY, J. WHATMOUGH, AND S. E. JOHNSON: <i>The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy</i> (Buck).		
Books Received		95

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Balaeric Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., 211 Honan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

Chicago

o. 1

1

10

23

32

43

58

66

80

95

ty of
year;
stage
public
Rica,
lands,
and
tries
s are
rafta.

anze,
tion.

pies,
ents,
pub-
stock

CLAS-

and

912.
d on



CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXX

JANUARY 1935

Number 1

A NEW DATING OF HORACE'S *DE ARTE POETICA*

BY JEFFERSON ELMORE

AMUCH-DISCUSSED point in the dating of this work is the reference to Aulus Casellius.¹ Not much is known of this eminent jurist.² It is fairly certain that he was urban praetor in 41 B.C., but until recently (or comparatively so) there was no extant indication of the date of his birth. Fortunately, in the *SC de Oropiis* of 73 B.C. (discovered in 1884) he appears as a member of the consular *concilium* (his name is No. 8 on the list; that of Marcus Tullius Cicero, No. 11). From the order of precedence and the date of the document itself, Mommsen concluded that Casellius was quaestor in 74 and was born not later than 104.³ He obtains this result by taking thirty years as the minimum age for the quaestorship.

There can be no doubt but that in the period between Sulla's revision of the constitution and the death of Caesar the quaestorship could be legally held at this age (Cicero was quaestor in 75), but it is also true (as Mommsen⁴ himself has shown) that, while legal, it was, in a sense, an exception. Under ordinary circumstances a minimum of

¹ *AP* 369-72.

"Consultus juris et actor
Causarum mediocris abest virtute diserti
Messallae, nec scit quantum Casellius Aulus,
sed tamen in pretio est."

² Jörs, *RE*, III, 1634-38.

³ *Hermes*, XX (1885), 282 f.; *Ges. Sch.*, VII, 175 f.

⁴ *St. R.*, I², 549 f.

thirty-seven years was required. This is clear from the two-year interval between magistracies and from the fact that the consulship was held at forty-three and the praetorship at forty, thus placing the quaestorship at thirty-seven. To clinch the matter, we have Cicero's statement regarding Pompey when the latter was at the age of thirty-six. At this time, says Cicero,⁵ Pompey was not eligible under the law to hold any office. There were, in fact, two age requirements for the quaestorship—one of thirty and the other of thirty-seven years. It is not known for certain under what respective conditions they were applied. Mommsen (I think rightly) supposes the lower requirement was permitted to those who planned to seek the aedileship also, and not permitted to those who intended to omit this office, and who would thus be obliged to wait longer before entering on a political career. This would seem a reasonable procedure. At all events, it is safe to say that only special circumstances could exempt the candidate from the higher-age requirement.

Let us see how this bears on the case of Cascellius. Is there warrant for assuming (as Mommsen assumes) that he entered upon the quaestorship in his thirtieth year? Apparently not. A man of firm and unyielding character, and devoted to his calling,⁶ he was little inclined to political life, particularly under existing conditions. He would wish to be quaestor for the sake of admission to the senate, and, in view of his legal interests, would also be willing to fill the quaestorship, but one can hardly think of him as aedile or as consul. He never sought either of these offices, and thus could not claim an exemption intended to facilitate a full political career. He would enter upon the quaestorship not at thirty but at thirty-seven, so that his birth should be placed not later than 110.

The date is confirmed by Cascellius' relation to Scaevola, the augur, of whom he is said⁷ to have been *auditor*. Scaevola (b. ca. 160) was alive during the Social War (90-88), but nearing his end. Cicero gives a vivid picture of him at this time—in extreme old age, broken in health, and feeble.⁸ His death, in all probability, as Petersson

⁵ *De imp. Pomp.* 21, 62.

⁶ *Val. Max.* vi. 2. 12.

⁷ Pliny *NH* viii. 144. Pliny's text is somewhat confused. Jörs (*op. cit.*) has dealt with it correctly.

⁸ *Phil.* viii. 10.

points out,⁹ occurred early in 87. Cascellius, if born in 104, could not have been *auditor* of Scaevola in the technical sense that the word possessed at the time;¹⁰ he might well have been such if born in 110, with his apprenticeship falling for the most part before the terrible days of the war. This later date also puts in clearer light the relation between Scaevola and Cascellius' father to which Cicero refers.¹¹ And, again, it gives point to the reference of Cascellius to himself as *senex* in 41 when he resisted, as *praetor*, illegal requests of the *triumvirs*. He was saved from consequences (he says) by his childlessness and by his old age—an appropriate remark for a man nearing seventy (not so appropriate for one of sixty-three).¹²

The date of Cascellius' death is not known; surviving his own generation and continuing on into that of Catullus and Horace, it is evident that he lived to be a very old man. In referring to him, along with Messalla, as an example of eminence in his calling, Horace implies not only that he was living but that he was active in maintaining his position and reputation. The point is just when this reference was made. It must, in any case, have been before Cascellius' ninetieth year. It is physically possible that he was older, but this is so improbable that it may be disregarded.¹³ Mommsen would set a much earlier limit,¹⁴ but (to be on the safe side) we take Cascellius' ninetieth year for the *terminus post quem*, and so proceed on our research for a definite date.

Of proposed solutions of this problem three have attracted special notice: (1) that Horace was writing in 8, the last year of his life (favored by the earlier commentators and now by Cichorius);¹⁵ (2) that he wrote in 15 (first suggested by Bentley in his note on *AP* 371 and revived by Rostagni);¹⁶ (3) that he wrote in 20 or thereabouts (pro-

⁹ Cicero: *A Biography*, p. 72.

¹⁰ Karlowa, *RRG*, I, 487.

¹¹ *Bab.* 20.

¹² Val. Max. *loc. cit.*

¹³ Cf. the facile remark of Schanz-Hosius (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 597) that the mention of Cascellius does not necessarily imply that he was living. One may be permitted a little impatience at this standing on the head critically in defense of a preconceived opinion. The words of Horace, moreover, do not permit this interpretation.

¹⁴ *Hermes*, XV, 144; *Ges. Sch.*, VII, 186.

¹⁵ *Römische Studien*, pp. 340-41.

¹⁶ *Arte poetica di Orazio*, pp. xii-xxxv.

posed by Reenen,¹⁷ reinforced by Michaelis,¹⁸ accepted by Nettle-
ship,¹⁹ Kiessling, Heinze, and others, and defended most recently by Otto Immisch.²⁰ These traditional solutions, which have inherent difficulties in other respects, are greatly affected by the reference to Cascellius. If he was born in 110, they are all chronologically impossible. Even if Mommsen's date of 104 be accepted, the first and second are ruled out and need not be further considered (though much could be said about them). With the third, the case is somewhat different. Strictly speaking, as far as Cascellius is concerned, it is chronologically possible, but in one vital respect it rests on an insecure foundation.

Reenen and Michaelis (to put the matter briefly) maintain that Horace wrote before the death of Vergil in 19 B.C. and after the death of Quintilius Varus.²¹ Both of these contentions may be admitted. But, in spite of its sound premises, the proposal is difficult of application. Thus, of the two sons of Gnaeus Piso (who now replaces Lucius),²² the elder was consul with Tiberius in 11, which places his birth not later than 44. In 20 he would be at least twenty-four years of age and ready for the quaestorship. As Horace shows him, he is still under his father's tutelage, his education incomplete, and the time of undertaking literary activity on his own account still quite in the future. In other words (as commentators agree), he was a youth of sixteen or seventeen. His brother, consul in 1 B.C., and born not later than 38, would be a youth of eighteen, which is too old for his part in the Horatian picture.

¹⁷ *Disputatio de Ep. ad Pisones* (Amsterdam, 1806).

¹⁸ "Die Horazischen Pisonen," *Com. in hon. Th. Mommseni* (Berlin, 1877).

¹⁹ *Jour. Phil.*, XII, 43-61.

²⁰ *Horazens Epistel über die Dichtkunst*, pp. 1-8.

²¹ *AP* 55, 438.

²² In defending Porphyrio's identification of the Horatian Pisos with Lucius Calpurnius Piso and his two sons, Rostagni encounters a difficulty in the age of the elder Piso, who died in 32 A.D., having, according to Tacitus (*An.* vi. 10. 3), reached his eightieth year. In this case Piso was born in 48, and in 15 could hardly have had sons old enough to profit by a discourse on poetry. To obtain an earlier date for Piso's birth Rostagni assumes that Tacitus is speaking in round numbers. It is much more likely that Tacitus is computing Piso's age from the latter's holding of the consulship in 15 at the age of thirty-three, the minimum age requirement fixed by Octavian after the battle of Actium (Mommsen, *St. R.*, I², 553). He assumes that Piso was consul in his own year (a very probable assumption), and it is only if this was not the case that Tacitus was in error.

Again, Gnaeus Piso, the father, was consul in 23 at the invitation of Augustus, and it would seem almost inconceivable that Horace should not recognize this great honor, or, at least, adopt a less casual attitude toward an ex-consul. We have already discussed the case of Aulus Casellius, who, in 20, would be at least eighty-four years of age.

Why is it, then, that this hypothesis, with its sound premises, does not work out in practice? I believe the reason is to be found in the *terminus post quem*. It is right to say that Horace wrote after the death of Quintilius Varus, but the point is: When did Varus die? According to Jerome, in 24/23,²³ but I think this is to be questioned. Jerome's credit for accuracy is anything but good, and he is always to be followed with caution.²⁴ In this case, it is against him that his dating is out of line with facts that we have been considering. It is also against him that Horace's lament for Varus should appear in the first book of the *Odes*. If it was composed in 23 at the end of the poet's lyrical career, it would hardly be included among his earliest efforts in this field. There is no known reason for such a transfer, and there is also no other instance of it. The *Propemtikon* to Vergil (i. 3), once regarded as such, is now recognized as an early composition. On the other hand, if the ode to Varus belongs to the first book, it would fall in the period 31-27. I should assign it to the year 28 and make this the *terminus post quem* of the work on poetry. The *terminus ante quem* might well be 23, the year of Piso's consulship.

This revision of the *terminus post quem* opens the way for an earlier dating of the discourse on poetry. It is my view that it should be assigned to the period 28-27, with emphasis on its completion in the latter year. There are reasons why it should be written at this time, and Horace, now nearing his fortieth year and at the height of his poetic powers (or nearly so), was equal to the task.²⁵

²³ *Chron.* (ed. Fotheringham), p. 247.

²⁴ Lietzmann, "Hieronymus," *RE*, VIII, 1575: "H. selbst bezeichnet die Chronik als *tumultuarium opus*, welches er dem *notario velocissime* diktiert habe." As an example of Jerome's inaccuracy we may cite the case of the orator Messala Corvinus (Hor. *op. cit.* 369). His birth he assigns to 59 and his death to A.D. 11. Both of those dates are incorrect.

²⁵ Mommsen (*op. cit.*) calls attention to the difficulty of reconciling the proposed dates of Horace's work with the age of Casellius as revealed in the *SC de Oropiis*. He is not convinced by Michaelis' paper written in his honor, and puts aside the idea of

This earlier date not only reveals an adequate background for Horace's work—circumstances existing at the time of which it was the outcome—but it also permits certain hitherto ill-adjusted details to fall into place. To begin with, the difficulty regarding Casellius disappears. If he was born in 104, he was in his seventy-seventh year; if in 110, in his eighty-third. Either age satisfies the context. Again, the earlier date gives point to the introduction (along with Casellius) of the orator, Messalla Corvinus. Born about 64 and, like Horace, coming to manhood as a supporter of the Republic, he finally went over to Octavian and fought with him at Actium. After the battle he was consul and in 27 celebrated a triumph after campaigns in Gaul. In 26 he was appointed *praefectus urbis* by Augustus, but held the office only a short time. He became *curator aquarum* in 11, which occupied the remainder of his career. It can be seen that in 27 he was at the height of his power and influence, so that the allusion to him by Horace, if made at this time, would come with extraordinary force and fitness.

Reference has been made to the Horatian Pisos. Their identification by Reenen with Gnaeus Piso and his two sons is rightly regarded as a step in advance, but it is overlooked that, owing to the known ages of the sons, it is not tenable on the traditional dating. It is tenable if we suppose the composition was in 28-27. At this time the sons were not too old for the Horatian picture.

The older son was not yet of an age to engage in literary composition on his own account. It was not certain as yet whether he possessed the requisite talent. He had excellent sense and would not go against his temperament (which lies back of judgment and purpose); but, nevertheless, if at some future time he decided to make the venture, he should submit his efforts to the criticism of his father, of Maecius, and of Horace himself.²⁶ They would be at his service in this indefinite future. This signifies (to say the least) that no one of the three was old, as Horace conceives the situation. How does this compare with the actual state of things in the year 27?

a *Jugendsgedicht* only on the ground that "die kluge und feine Poetik" could not have been written by Horace as a young man. (And yet Alexander Pope wrote his masterly *Essay on Criticism* before he was twenty-one.) Mommsen regarded the problem as still unsolved.

²⁶ *Op. cit.* 385-90.

Horace himself was thirty-eight. The elder Piso was older, but not by more than five years. As to Maecius, there is some uncertainty. In 55 he was director of the plays and spectacles which were performed at the dedication of Pompey's theater. "We had to sit through," writes Cicero,²⁷ "whatever Maecius Tarpa approved of." Twenty years later he appears as *iudex* of poetical competitions in the Temple of the Muses.²⁸ It is also as *iudex* that he is mentioned as available adviser of the youthful Piso. The title *iudex* suggests that Maecius, having unusual discrimination, came into prominence as umpire of literary contests rather than by the slower method of teaching, in which case it would be conservative to assume, at the time of his engagement by Pompey, that he was not over thirty. In 27 he would be fifty-eight, which corresponds to the impression given by Horace, in which there is no intimation of old age or declining activity.

Back of the mention of Maecius (and of Quintilius) is Horace's conviction of the value of criticism. In verses 438-62 he describes what happens when it is neglected or refused. The young poet, fed on the flattery of his friends, comes to maturity with an obsession of his own greatness which amounts to a species of insanity. He goes through the street spouting his verses. The people fear him and flee from him; venturesome children torment him, until he finally falls in a pit and no one heeds his cries for help. In substance this is similar to *Sat.* i. 4. 33-38, where the poet (at least in the popular mind) appears as an overweening individual seeking whom he may injure, and (like a dangerous steer in the streets) hated and feared by the populace. These two passages also resemble each other in form in that they are both examples of burlesque. Though not uncongenial to his temperament, burlesque is rare in Horace. It is not found in the *Odes* or in the *Epistles*, but crops up occasionally in the *Satires*.²⁹ It is a mark of Horace's early manner, and when we find the most perfect example in the work on poetry, it is a sign that this also is an out-growth of the earlier period.

Again in *AP* 317-18 we find a reflection and adaption of *Sat.* i. 4.

²⁷ *Fam.* vii. 1.

²⁸ *Sat.* i. 10. 38.

²⁹ E.g., i. 2. 127-34; i. 3. 6-18, 133-35; i. 4. 34-38. Cf. *AP* 1-5, which has the character of burlesque.

105-29. In the latter Horace relates how (under his father's guidance) he obtained information regarding the matter of conduct. For right conduct he selected men who had been successful and were respected, and, observing them, found what was necessary for his own guidance. Later (*ibid.*, 309-18) he comes to consider how the young poet may gain knowledge of life. For the basic social relations he will be sufficiently instructed by the books of the philosophers, but for learning about the concrete, current experience of the actual world with the motives that inspire it, he must seek out some notable person who embodies it, who, in Horace's words, is an exemplar of life and manners.³⁰ This is a reflection of the method prescribed by Horace's father. The young poet is to obtain knowledge of life in the same manner as he obtained knowledge of conduct.

When the intending poet has made his preparation he should choose a subject within the compass of his powers. In this (apparently original) counsel Horace is recalling and generalizing an early personal experience; I mean that in which he found the kind of writing suited to his talents. He was not adapted to the epic and from the first let it be known that he regarded the achievements of Octavian and Agrippa as beyond his ability. It is possible that he had also in mind the case of Vergil, whose proper field was the *molle et facetum*, and whose undertaking of an epic theme on a large scale was in reality a tempting of Providence. This attitude toward Vergil would be natural at the beginning of his enterprise, but certainly not so, nearly ten years later, when the great work (already heralded) was all but finished. Nor, at this later date, would Horace himself have occasion (as he had earlier) to emphasize the point.³¹

In addition to these specific indications of an early date there is another of a more general character, viz., the influence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who arrived at Rome in 30 and whose *De compositione verborum* appeared shortly thereafter. It is from this work (and not from Neoptolemus) that Horace obtained the cue for the scheme

³⁰ Cf. Thomas Hardy, *On an Invitation to the United States*:

"I trace the lives such scenes enshrine,
Give past exemplars present room,
And their experience count as mine."

³¹ Horace's vivid and intimate reference to Quintilius Varus as an example of the honest critic (*AP* 438-39) is also, no doubt, a reflection of personal experience.

of his poem. However, this point can only be mentioned here (I hope to discuss it later).

There is one further consideration: What special circumstance would give rise to this work in 28-27? With the publication of the second book of the *Satires* in 30, Horace must have realized that he was done with this form of writing. Confident of the validity and value of his inner life, Horace felt it artistically unsatisfactory to be obliged to address his intimate revelations to the public in general. The need of a definite audience was deep-seated in him, and he had already turned to the lyric manner with its special address. Personal satire, moreover, was hazardous under the Roman law,³² and in his moral preaching he had exhausted most of the available themes. There was one subject he had dealt with and had not exhausted, that of literary criticism. To put down all he had in mind and in a somewhat new fashion would be to follow out a deeply felt interest, and so to proceed in organic relation to his previous work.

Again, this was the period following the return from the East, when Octavian thought to make literature a factor in social reconstruction. Vergil was already busy on what was destined to be the national epic. For Vergil, a confirmed Caesarian, this rôle was a natural one, but Horace's position was more difficult. Personally, he disliked Octavian (the man who had robbed him of his patrimony). At heart a Republican, he was yet sickened by the civil wars, and saw in Octavian's régime the only possible salvation. He could not, like Vergil, inspire political sentiment, but he could stimulate the intellectual life of the people, which centered in poetry, whose banner he would raise anew. He would not write a textbook (God forbid!) but would preach the excellence of poetry and the ideals every true poet must follow. And he performed this task well, bringing to it enthusiasm and wit and understanding.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

³² *Sat.* ii. 1. 60-86.

THE IMAGE IN THE SAND

BY JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

DILATING upon the glories of the old-fashioned education and upon the superb modesty of the boys of the past generation, the Right Logic of Aristophanes' *Clouds* caps the climax by the statement that when they rose from the sand of the palaestra where they had been sitting *προνοεῖσθαι | εἰδωλον τοῖσιν ἔρασταῖσιν τῆς ἥβης μὴ καταλείπειν* (*Nub.* 975 f.). This interesting passage has two aspects, which for the sake of convenience may be taken separately. Let us consider first the act, then the reason for it.

The older editors and commentators afford scant comment on the act. Van Leeuwen refers us to Diphilus, fragment 51, where someone is described as *τὸν ἀμφιτάπητα συστορέσας* on arising. The reference is to a sort of shaggy cloth which preserves a trace of the imprint of whatever has been imposed upon it. Influenced, no doubt, by the passage in the *Clouds*, Van Leeuwen interprets "ne imago cubantis in eo appareat." In 1922 Roussel observed that the erasure of traces of sitting bodies was originally a precaution against *Spurzauber*,¹ i.e., magic practiced on traces left by some portion of a body on a soft or yielding material. Seven years later Deonna adduced examples to show that footprints were especially liable to magical abuse by malevolent persons.² These references I owe to a note by Otto Weinreich.³ McCartney⁴ calls attention to the fact that injury might be inflicted on an enemy through the impression or mold of a body upon a bed. He does not refer to the passage in the *Clouds*, but quotes various passages containing directions to smooth (or ruffle) bedclothes on rising.

None of these writers, however, seems to have noticed, or considered it worthy of remark, that such prescriptions or observations occur principally in the lore popularly ascribed to the Pythagoreans.

¹ *Rev. étud. anc.*, 1922, pp. 185 f.

² *Rev. étud. grecques*, XLII (1929), 179 f.

³ *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXVIII (1930), 183 f.

⁴ *Folklore Heirlooms*, "Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters," XVI (1931), 179.

It is fully recognized that the so-called symbols of Pythagoras are really specimens of common folklore. After duly observing this fact, Frazer⁵ goes on to remark that the ancient philosophers, quite puzzled by them, accorded them serious treatment and tried by fantastic interpretations to wring from them some drop of moral wisdom or wrench them into some semblance of philosophical profundity.⁶

This type of prescription seems to assume three forms: (1) the smoothing of bedclothes; (2) the obliteration of the traces left by a pot in the ashes; and (3) the obliteration of footprints. Of these the first and the second are usually mentioned in conjunction. In Plutarch⁷ we find that Lucius, a pupil of Moderatus, the Pythagorean, laid great stress on the symbols, such, for instance, as ruffling the bedclothes on rising from bed and not leaving the print of a pot which has been removed from the ashes but rubbing it out. A little later we read: "Philinus says they obliterated the print of a pot." "The ruffling of the bedding however seemed to some to have no secret significance, ἀλλ' αὐτόθεν φάνεσθαι τὸ μὴ πρέπον, ἀδρὶ συγκεκομημένης γαμετῆς, χώραν δρᾶσθαι καὶ τύπον ὥσπερ ἐκμαγεῖον ἀπολειπόμενον."⁸ Of the thirty-nine symbols given in Iamblichus *Protrepticicon* 21 the twenty-ninth reads: "On rising from the bedclothes he used to roll them up and smooth out the impression [of his body]," and the thirty-fourth: "Obliterate from the dust the mark left by a pot." Diogenes Laertius (viii. 1. 17) gives in close connection the two precepts of Pythagoras: τὰ στρώματα ἀεὶ συνδέδεμένα ἔχειν and χύτρας ἵχνος συγχέειν ἐν τῇ τέφρᾳ. Clement of Alexandria⁹ brings the smoothing of the bedclothes into juxtaposition with the elimination of the traces left by a pot in the dust: Pythagoras directed his followers not to leave the mark (*τύφον*) in the dust but to obliterate it, and on rising from bed to ruffle the bedclothes. Still a further form of the bedclothes prescription alone is given in Mullach: "On rising from bedclothes, roll them up and ruffle the place";¹⁰ and, finally, in Diogenes Laertius we again find the two

⁵ *Folklore*, I, 147 f.

⁶ On Androcydes as source of such exegesis see I. Levy, *Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore* (Paris, 1926), pp. 67 ff. This reference and other valuable suggestions I owe to my colleague, Professor W. A. Heidel.

⁷ *Quaest. conv.* viii. 7. 1 (727 b, c).

⁹ *Stromata* v. 5. 661 (Pott).

⁸ *Ibid.* 7. 4 (728b).

¹⁰ *Frag. Phil. Graec.*, I, 506, 33.

together: "to have the bedclothes always tied together" and "to obliterate the trace of a pot in the ashes."¹¹

These prescriptions, then, would seem by their very juxtaposition to have something in common. What this was the ancient interpreters seem to have no idea. Abstruse and moral meanings are adduced for the ruffling of the bedclothes, such as (1) that it was a symbol to dissuade from an afternoon nap, by removing early in the day all sleeping equipment: "By day when we have arisen we should be active and not leave a trace as it were of a dead body";¹² (2) that it was a means of obliterating from the waking memory all traces of the night's pleasures: *ώς μήτε διειρωγμοῦ τινος μηδὲ μήν ύπνου μεθ' ήμέραν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τῆς ἐν νυκτὶ ἡδόνης ἐπιμεμνῆσθαι ζτι*,¹³ to which Clement adds the guess: (3) that perhaps it was a riddling recommendation to obliterate the fantasy of darkness by the light of truth: "Rising from the folly of sleep and nocturnal darkness do not introduce the carnal into the daylight of philosophy but clear out and obliterate from your memory all traces of that slumber."¹⁴

For the obliteration of the traces of a pot that has stood in ashes, similarly fantastic interpretations were put forward. It was a parable of the laying-aside of all anger for injuries received; it was a warning to the philosopher to abandon material and sensible proofs and rely henceforth upon the purely intellectual: "For one must leave no clear trace of anger, but whenever, after boiling up, it ceases and subsides, one must wipe out all remembrance of injury."¹⁵

In spite of these far-fetched moral explanations it is permissible to suspect that this custom, which Plutarch tells us was carried out in all its literalness only by the Etruscans,¹⁶ was some kind of *Spurzäuber*. Frazer¹⁷ is certainly right in thinking that the foregoing explanations were aetiological attempts to account for some rule of forgotten meaning. "He probably feared that the persons who ate out

¹¹ viii. 1. 17. On the date and the sources of the Pythagorean material in Diogenes see Levy, *op. cit.*, pp. 88, 89, n. 2.

¹² Plut. *op. cit.* viii. 7. 4 (728c).

¹³ Clem. Alex. *op. cit.* v. 5. 28, 661 (Pott); cf. Plut. *op. cit.* viii. 7 (728b) for a less abstruse expression of a similar idea.

¹⁴ Iamb. *Protr.* (366K).

¹⁵ Plut. *op. cit.* viii. 7. 4 (728b).

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 1 (727d).

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, I, 160.

of the pot might be magically injured by any enemy who should tamper with the impression left in the ashes by the pot."

The obliteration of footprints is not, so far as I know, attested for the Pythagoreans,¹⁸ and there are consequently no moral interpretations advanced to conceal the stark magical intent of the practice. The passage from which we derive our information is given us by Lucian.¹⁹ One courtesan is describing to another a hate charm (*μίσηθρον*) to be used against a rival for the affections of Phanias: "Watching the footprint whenever she leaves one, I was to rub it out and walk with my right foot in her left print and with my left in her right and say, 'I've walked on you and am on top.'" Evidently the success of this charm depended upon the rival's leaving a footprint accessible to such treatment. Weinreich²⁰ brings the foregoing passage into comparison with a Syrian inscription found in *Musée belge*, IV, 309, 52: *ἰχνος ἔχων, πᾶσ' ἀν* *ἰχνος ἔχων ἀνέθηκα Σεράπει*, which he interprets to mean that, instead of using magical words and acts on a footprint, one might obtain the help of a god by dedicating to him an image of the print. This is perhaps cognate with the custom of the *Nēoi* of Cyzicus, interestingly described by C. A. Forbes.²¹ They dedicated to the gymnasium where they had spent their youth stone likenesses of their footprints.²² These were sometimes dedicated in pairs, one by each of two friends, and in such cases the object may well have been to put under the protection of some god the footprints, whose exposure to malevolent handling by foes of these two friends might injure one of the pair or at least put an evil spell upon the continuance of their friendship. But one must not make too much of this. How dangerous it was to leave a clear footprint appears from a precept of Pythagoras, who forbade the running of a nail or a knife (*ferro*)²³ into a footprint, obviously with the intent of laming the foot that had made the print. It is a world-wide belief²⁴ that by mutilating a

¹⁸ But cf. Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 510.

¹⁹ *Dial. Mer.* 4, 5.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

²¹ *Nēoi* ("Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association," No. 2 [1933]), p. 58.

²² Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen* (1914), pp. 103 ff.

²³ Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 510.

²⁴ Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, 159.

footprint you injure the foot that left it. To such prohibition is attached the meaning that one must not abuse the memory of the dead, i.e., their "footprints on the sands of time." This is much of a piece with the explanations adduced for the ruffling of the bedclothes and the smoothing of the ashes under the pot. There was danger, then, that injury might be worked on a whole human body through the impression left by any part of it in a yielding material such as bedclothes, ashes, or sand. This may well have been the real reason for the practice of smoothing the sand when one rose from sitting in it naked.

The feeling that some precaution must be taken in such cases may have been enhanced by another series of beliefs which emphasized the danger of sitting on certain things. In Hesiod we find a prescription that a boy of twelve (days) should not sit *ἐπ' ἀκινήτοισι*, "for it is not better; it makes a man manless: nor a boy of twelve months either."²⁵ This again was too much for the ancient interpreters, who proceeded to explain it as a precaution against laziness or inactivity. Hesiod meant, they said, that boys should not be allowed to spend their time inactively sitting around, but should be kept in motion, running around, as it were. This explanation emphasizes the sitting and makes the word *καθίζειν* connote laziness. But it has the defect of quite ignoring the critical phrase *ἐπ' ἀκινήτοισι*.²⁶ Zenobius²⁷ informs us that *ἀκίνητα* are altars, tombs, and heroa, to which Plato²⁸ adds boundaries. Of these it would seem that tombs were by far the most perilous to those who sat upon them; in fact, we know of no danger threatening those who sat on altar or on boundary stone,²⁹ while another of the Pythagorean symbols³⁰ prohibits sleeping upon a tomb (characteristically interpreted to mean "Don't get soft with laziness after you have inherited your parents' property"), and there are

²⁵ *Works and Days* 750. In Gaisford, *PMG* (Leipsic, 1823), II, 408, the scholium reads *ἐπὶ τάφῳ καθέσθαι*.

²⁶ A curious twist in the meaning is given by Moschopoulos; cf. Gaisford, *op. cit.*, II, 409: *ἐπει τὸ ἀκινητεῖν καὶ ἄνδρα τέλειον βλάπτει*, etc.

²⁷ i. 55.

²⁸ *Laws* 842. That tombs are implied is confirmed by the words of the *Etymologicum magnum* (Leipsic, 1816), I, 44.

²⁹ Sikes, *Class. Rev.*, VII (1893), 383.

³⁰ Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 510, 17.

widespread superstitions about the danger of stepping over or treading upon a grave.

Why a boy's sitting on a tomb should result in the loss of his virility poses an interesting question. Wilamowitz³¹ somewhat cavalierly remarks that we can peacefully leave this question to the wise women: "Wochen- und Kinderstube sind im Aberglauben unerschöpflich." True enough, but it is tempting, nevertheless, to follow a lead suggested by certain lines of Hesiod (753-55), immediately following the passage which we are at present considering. There a warning is given against men's washing in women's baths, which, it is hinted, may make the men unvirile. Goettling (*ad loc.*) interpreted this to mean that warm—i.e., effeminate—baths are dangerous to men. But it may refer as well to the idea that there is some magical³² detriment attaching to the use by a man of what a woman has used. In this light the warning against a boy's sitting on a tomb lest he lose his virility becomes intelligible. In the days when men were still ignorant of the true process of generation, the birth of the child was ascribed not to any act of the father but to the entry into the mother of the soul of some dead ancestor, whose name was then given to the child newly born. To secure this child the mother sometimes went and sat among the tombs. Where such a custom existed the tomb would be an appropriate and characteristic seat for a woman, but by the same token inappropriate and even dangerous for a male.³³ The same detriment would be visited upon a boy who sat there that would come to a man who used a woman's bath.

If the real reason why the boy must erase the image of himself in the sand was the possibility that by leaving traces of his body he expose himself to magical malevolence from an enemy or put himself magically in the power of an unwelcome lover, why does Aristophanes substitute a reason so different?

³¹ On Hesiod, "Works and Days" (1928), p. 128.

³² Proclus *ap.* Gaisford, *op. cit.*, II, 409, speaks of certain off-falls from a woman's body which defile a man if they come into the same air or water with him. The rationalizing explanation made the maxim a prohibition against bathing with the woman's intent of adornment; cf. Sikes, *op. cit.*, VII, 394.

³³ The scholia in Gaisford, *op. cit.*, II, 408, show that the danger is not confined to boys: ἔτει, καὶ ἄνηρ, ἀν τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, βλάπτεται; *ibid.*, p. 407: ἀλλ' οὐ μόνον δωδεκαταιῶν ταῦτα ή δωδεκάμηνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα ἄνθρωπον φεύγειν τὰς τοιαύτας ἔδρας, where it may be suspected that the writer is using ἄνθρωπον for ἄνδρα.

The answer is obvious. Aristophanes is a humorist, and wilful misinterpretation is a recognized and most effective form of humor. I hope at some other time to discuss this aspect of the humor of Aristophanes, of which it would be easy to catalogue some sixty or seventy instances. He misinterprets sights, such as the apparently aimless wandering of meteors through the sky (*Pax* 832); more frequently he misinterprets sounds, directions, remarks in a foreign tongue, questions, and even silences. He misinterprets motives and causes, the reasons for facts of natural history, the upright comb of the cock (*Aves* 486), the reason for the throwing of water by the old women on the old men (*Lys.* 350), the presumably aesthetic longing of Dionysus for Euripides as homosexual (*Ran.* 66), etc. Similarly, *in malam partem* and with even more comical effect he misinterprets a well-known precaution against magic as an act of very exaggerated modesty on the part of a very model youth. He follows this immediately by another counsel of perfection:

*ἐν ταινοτρίβον δὲ καθίζοντας τὸν μηρὸν ἔδει προβαλέσθαι
τοὺς παιᾶς, ὅπως τοῖς ξέωθεν μηδὲν δείξειαν ἀπηνέ* [972 f.]

where *ἄγεννες* has been conjectured for *ἀπηνές*. This may equally well be a burlesque misinterpretation of something—we know not what. In any case it serves as the basis and preparation for the joke about the image in the sand, just as so often in the *Birds* the words of Peisthetaerus furnish the opportunity for his comic foil, Euelpides, to produce some fantastic suggestion as to the reason for some well-known fact, the usual formula being some variation of “Oh, that’s the reason why” (cf. Strepsiades in *Nub.* 394).

We have already seen that not only the smoothing or ruffling of that on which one has been lying but also of the ashes from which a pot has been removed, as well as the prohibition of a boy’s sitting on a tomb, are all connected with Pythagoras. Whether the ascription is correct is immaterial for our purpose. It is enough to know that popularly Pythagoras was held responsible for them.³⁴

Burnet and A. E. Taylor have made much of the Pythagorean

³⁴ For the relation of Hesiod’s *Works and Days* to Pythagoreanism see Cantarella, “Elementi primitivi nella poesia Esiodea,” *Riv. indo-greca-italica*, January, 1932, p. 22 (126).

features in the Platonic picture of Socrates. Taylor³⁵ finds that the common source of the Platonic and the Xenophontic Socrates is Pythagorean and that Aristophanes in his *Clouds* confirms the picture, derived from the *Phaedo*, of the Pythagorean entourage of Socrates.³⁶ In the Phrontisterion of the *Clouds* he finds a skit on a Pythagorean community or *δημακοῖον*,³⁷ practicing *ἄσκησις*,³⁸ engaged in abstruse research,³⁹ interested in spiritism and necromancy.⁴⁰ The Socrates of Plato he does not find very different from the so-called caricature of Aristophanes.⁴¹ Taylor's article on "The Impiety of Socrates"⁴² pointed out the Pythagorean traits in the Platonic Socrates; his discussion of the Phrontisterion⁴³ emphasizes the Pythagorean traits in the Socrates of the *Clouds*. He makes a fairly good case, since he can show undoubted "Pythagorean" features in the Socrates of the *Clouds*; for example, the silence (*έχεμθία*) of the disciples⁴⁴ is parodied by the absolute stillness demanded for the birth of an idea;⁴⁵ the connection of thought with air;⁴⁶ the ascetic and spiritist interests of the refectory;⁴⁷ the quibble about the old and the new day;⁴⁸ the Tropionius-cavelike aspect of the refectory;⁴⁹ the attention paid to rhythms;⁵⁰ the oath by the air;⁵¹ the fondness of Socrates for mathematics;⁵² and, at the very end of the play,⁵³ the burning of the refectory in comic parody of the burning of the *συνέδρια* of the Pythagoreans at the time of their suppression in Italy. Certain of these parallels are not themselves especially convincing, but Taylor properly reminds us that the combined effect of so many details adds a good deal of strength to his case.

³⁵ *Varia Socratica* (Oxford, 1911), p. 33.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 130, 166.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 148 n.; p. 151, n. 1.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 148.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 129-77, esp. p. 148, n. 1; p. 165, n. 1; p. 168, n. 1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-39.

⁴⁶ *Nubes* 135 ff.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 148, n. 1.

⁴⁵ *Varia Socratica*, p. 165, n. 1; p. 166 n.; *Nubes* 229 ff., 763.

⁴⁷ *Varia Socratica*, pp. 146, 168.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 167 n.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 175.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Now we have seen above that the contest between the Right Logic and the Wrong contains at least one very definite "Pythagorean" detail, far more distinctive and clear-cut than any of those adduced by Taylor. Why, then, did he not make use of it? So far as I am aware, students of Aristophanes have consistently failed to recognize the Pythagorean character of this particular detail of the image in the sand; but, if Taylor had seen it, he could scarcely have employed it for his argument. For it is ascribed not, as Taylor's argument requires, to Socrates and his school but to their opponents, the old-fashioned education, the *δίκαιος λόγος*. And it is by no means the only Pythagorean feature in this anti-Socratic picture. A little investigation will make it clear that the education opposed to that of Socrates is crammed with features popularly ascribed to Pythagoras and his followers, and that these are more numerous and more clear than the best that Taylor has brought forward on the other side. I shall list these "Pythagorean" features, following for convenience the order in which they are mentioned in the play of Aristophanes.

I. The boy must maintain silence *πρῶτον μὲν ἔδει παιδὸς φωνὴν γρίζαντος μηδέν' ἀκοῦσαι* (963). This suggests the well-known Pythagorean rule of silence (*έχεμνθια*). For five years the Pythagorean novitiate must keep silence, doing nothing but listen to discourses.⁵⁴ We have already referred to the query of Taylor,⁵⁵ whether, in the absolute silence required for the conception and birth of a thought (*φρόντις*)⁵⁶ we have not a parody of the Pythagorean *έχεμνθια*. The passage refers to a loud noise, such as knocking at a door, and has apparently nothing whatever to do with the prohibition of speech.

II. He was to use the lyre: *βαδίζειν . . . ἐς κιθαριστοῦ* (983; cf. 1357). Evidently the Pythagoreans did not approve of the flute. The sixtieth symbolon⁵⁷ reads: *φδαῖς χρῆσθαι πρὸς λύραν*. Diogenes says: "To sing to the lyre and by hymns to show due gratitude to gods and to good men."⁵⁸ On Plato's opposition to the flute see *Rep.* 398 c ff.

⁵⁴ Diogenes Laertius viii. 8.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 148, n. 1.

⁵⁶ *Nubes* 137; cf. Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 508, 66; cf. Clem. Alex. *op. cit.* v. 559 (Sylb.).

⁵⁷ Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 507; cf. *ibid.*, 510, 20: "Lyram illotis manibus non attingendum."

⁵⁸ Hicks (viii. 24), "Loeb Classical Library Series," p. 340.

III. He must not sit cross-legged, i.e., with thighs pressed closely together: *τώ μηρώ μὴ ξυνέχοντας* (966); *οὐδὲ ἵσχειν τώ πόδεν ἐναλλάξ* (983). Merry, I think, in his note on the passage fails to appreciate how full this whole passage is of folk lore, when he explains this as a prohibition against fidgeting and a demand that the boy stand at attention. There are several passages in the literature where one may find expressed or implied the dread of crossing objects. It brings bad luck, says Sikes,⁵⁹ who explains in this way the curious Hesiodic prohibition⁶⁰ against laying the wine ladle across the bowl. Women in parturition are disastrously affected if anyone present sits with legs crossed,⁶¹ and ancient Roman magistrates and senators were forbidden to sit cross-legged at their deliberations. Any business transacted in that position would surely fail. I cannot lay my hands on any direct evidence that the cross-legged position as such was forbidden to Pythagoreans,⁶² but Cantarella has shown how closely parallel to the extant Pythagorean symbols are the prohibitions of the *Works and Days*.⁶³

IV. He must not play the buffoon: *εἰ δέ τις αὐτῶν βωμολοχεῖσθαι* . . . *έτριβετο τυπτόμενος πολλάς, ὡς τὰς Μούσας ἀφανίζων* (470-72). This evidently refers to musical buffoonery, but the term employed may equally well refer to any coarse or rude jesting. We may compare line 1003: *οὐ στωμάλλων κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν τριβολεκτράπελ' οὐαπέρ οἱ νῦν*. Diogenes Laertius, amid his praises of Pythagoras, says that he abstained entirely from such indulgences as jests and idle stories.⁶⁴

V. He must show respect to his elders, and especially to his parents:

981 οὐδέν ἀν ἐλέσθαι δειπνοῦντ' ἐξην κεφάλαιον τῆς ῥαφανίδος.
 οὐδέν ἀνηθόν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀρπάξειν οὐδὲ σέλινον.
 993 καὶ τῶν θάκων τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ὑπνιστασθαι προσιούσιν.
 καὶ μὴ περὶ τοὺς σαντοῦ γονέας σκαιουργέν.
 998 μηδέ ἀντειπεῖν τῷ πατρὶ μηδέν, μηδέ Ἰαπετὸν καλέσαντα
 μηησικακῆσαι τὴν ἡλικίαν, οὐκ ἡς ἐνεοττοροφήθης.

⁵⁹ *Op. cit.*, VII, 389.

⁶⁰ *Works and Days* 744 ff.

⁶¹ Pliny *NH* xxvii. 17.

⁶² Winckelmann, *Hist. Anc. Art* (Boston: Osgood, 1880), I, 359, says that it was considered unseemly among the Pythagoreans to throw the right thigh over the left, but he gives no source or authority for his statement.

⁶³ See n. 34.

⁶⁴ viii. 18.

With these citations we may set the statement of Diogenes⁶⁵ that Pythagoras told men that it behooved them to honor their elders and that of all men parents were entitled to honor in the highest degree. But, of course, such sentiments as these are not especially characteristic of Pythagoreanism.

VI. He must not giggle: *οὐδὲ κιχλίζειν* (983). Loud laughter is mentioned as a pleasure of which the Right Logic would deprive the young (*καχασμά* [1073]). His opponent expressly permits the young to laugh (1078). Pythagoras himself was said to have abstained wholly from laughter.⁶⁶ He used to say that modesty and decorum consisted in never yielding to laughter and yet not wearing sullen looks (Hicks).

VII. He must abstain from baths: *κάπιστήσει μισεῖν ἀγοράν καὶ βαλανέιων ἀπέχεσθαι* (991). In its context this might mean merely abstention from bathing in public places where time was likely to be grievously wasted. Among the Pythagorean symbols, however, we find: *οὐδὲ εἰς περιφραντήριον ἐμβάπτειν οὐδὲ ἐν βαλανέιω λούεσθαι.*⁶⁷

But as we read further in the *Clouds*, it seems that a chief, if not the chief, objection was the enervating effect of the hot baths. Already in Hesiod's *Works and Days* we find a prohibition against the use of women's baths by men. This may be of Pythagorean provenience. But it is clear that Aristophanes either did not so understand it or else chose wilfully to misinterpret it, for the Unjust Logic says that he will refute his rival, *δύτις σε θερμῷ φησι λοῦσθαι . . . οὐκ ἔάσειν* (1044), and asks what is the harm in hot baths. His opponent objects to them on two counts, one very general, one more particular: (1) they are a very bad thing; (2) they make a man *δειλόν*. Here the Unjust Logic introduces a quibble by which he proves that of all the children of Zeus, the one who was *ἄριστος ψυχήν* and who performed the most labors, the mighty Heracles himself, was the one for whom warm baths were actually named. *'Ανδρεῖος*, then, is here not only the opposite of *δειλός*, but also etymologically of *ἄνανδρος*. The Unjust Logic maintains that the use of the warm bath will not unfavorably affect virility.

⁶⁵ Diog. Laert. viii. 19.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 18; Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 35; see Levy, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

⁶⁷ Mullach, *op. cit.*, I, 508, 69.

VIII. He must be temperate in the use of, or entirely abstain from, wine:

ἡδονῶν θ' δσων μέλλεις ἀποστερέσθαι,
παῖδων γυναικῶν κοττάβων ὄψιν πότων καχασμῶν [1072 f.].

Diogenes says that Pythagoras never drank wine in the daytime; he was never known to have eaten too much, to have drunk too much, or to indulge in the pleasures of love.⁶⁸ But Aristophanes (*Nub.* 417) includes a warning against wine among the directions given by Socrates to his rustic pupil.

IX. They must abstain from the pleasures of love:

μηδ' εἰς δραχηστρίδος εἰσάγγειν, ίνα μὴ πρὸς ταῦτα κεχηρώς
μῆλω βληθεὶς ὑπὸ πορνιδίου τῆς εἰκλειας ἀποθραυσθῆ [996 f.].

A fortiori a man must remain true to his own wife. The Unjust Logic ridicules such notions (1076 ff.). The new morality refuses to see anything disgraceful in adultery, even when it is detected. Pythagoras generally disapproved of sexual pleasures (viii. 9).⁷⁰ When he descended into Hades, he saw subjected to special punishment τῶν μὴ θέλοντας συνεῖναι ταῖς ἑαντῶν γυναιξὶ,⁷¹ which seems to be better rendered (Hicks)⁷² "those who would not remain faithful to their own wives" than "who refrained from commerce with their wives" (Yonge). Pythagoras, like Paul, was merely making concession to the desires of the flesh. He means, however, to emphasize that the permission applies only to their own wives. Pythagoras himself had a wife and begat two children.⁷³

X. Finally, the very name of the Just Logic shows the stress that is laid on justice by the poet in his picture of the old or non-Socratic education. With this is to be compared the dictum of Proclus, μὴ δεῖν τὸ δίκαιον ὑπερβαίνειν, in his discussion of the Pythagorean elements in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (744 f.). Amply sufficient has been said to prove that the non-Socratic elements in the *Clouds* are more full of "Pythagorean" touches than are the features which the poet

⁶⁸ Diog. Laert. viii. 18; cf. *ibid.*, 9, 13, and 38 (from the *Pythagorist* of Antiphon: ἐσθίοντας τε λάχανά τε καὶ πίνοντας ἐκ τούτους ὄδωρ).

⁶⁹ See l. 1073 *supra*; also ll. 1014, 1018, 1078.

⁷⁰ Diog. Laert. viii. 9.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 21.

⁷² "Loeb Classical Library Series"; so Levy, *op. cit.*, pp. 37, 132.

⁷³ Diog. Laert. viii. 42 f.

ascribes to the master of the *Phrontisterion*. I am not at all sure that such was the poet's intent. Some of these "Pythagorean" elements are probably commonplaces of semi-ascetic morality, the stock-in-trade of all who would guide youth away from the paths of sensual pleasure. This is admittedly true of the precept that parents be respected. The prohibition of wine Aristophanes ascribes both to Socrates and to the Just Logic (*supra*, p. 21). Other features, such as insistence on the use of the lyre, may well have been the earmarks of any and all conservatives in matters of religion. Still others are clearly more special and relate to definite superstitions. Many such we know were stressed by the Pythagoreans or were popularly supposed to be part and parcel of their paraphernalia of prohibition. Such is the bit of *Spurzauber* with which our discussion began. It may belong to Pythagoreanism no more than to the folklore of the countryside. But if anything so well attested as adopted by Pythagoreans had been found on the other side of this *agon*, if, furthermore, this had been reinforced by half a score more, all ascribed to Pythagoras and his followers on ancient authority, Taylor would inevitably have felt his position strengthened and could scarcely have failed to argue from them in favor of his hypothesis that Aristophanes was ridiculing Socrates and his ilk as practitioners of Pythagoreanism. I am not prepared to maintain that Aristophanes was consciously adopting, and, by implication, praising Pythagorean principles. The astounding series of Pythagorean features in the doctrine of the *Dikaios Logos* may be pure coincidence. But certainly the strength of the less numerous and less distinctive elements that Taylor has discovered on the Socratic side is seriously weakened, if not eliminated, by their counterweight.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

ROME'S BATTLES WITH ETRUSCANS AND GAULS IN 284-282 B.C.

By E. T. SALMON

FOR an account of Rome's fighting against the Etruscans and the Gauls in the years 284-282 Mommsen's dictum¹ that only Polybius' version² is trustworthy has been widely accepted. It is in close accordance with it, for example, that Professor Tenney Frank gives his description of these years in the *Cambridge Ancient History*.³

Mommsen's investigation of this period is indeed marked by his usual acumen and insight, but his results cannot be accepted in their entirety without question. Other investigators have reached this conclusion. For instance, De Sanctis, although admitting the general excellence of Mommsen's comments,⁴ rejects his date (284) for the colonization of Sena Gallica; he prefers the date suggested by Livy (290-289).⁵ Pais too points out that Mommsen's version of events is not entirely satisfactory;⁶ while Beloch adduces definite and specific reasons against unreservedly accepting Mommsen's view.⁷

However, Mommsen did perform the great service of emphasizing that the extant ancient accounts of these years fall into two categories which may be conveniently labeled the earlier version and the later version, respectively. Polybius represents the earlier version, while Livy⁸ and certain other later writers⁹ represent the later. Now, if Mommsen's thesis that only Polybius' version merits credence is antiquated—and the cogency of Beloch's arguments can scarcely be denied, whatever we may think of the speculation on the date of the colonization of Sena Gallica that accompanies them—then it is time

¹ *Römische Forschungen*, II, 365-75. ⁴ *Storia dei Romani*, II, 376, n. 2.

² ii. 19. 7-20. 6.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, II, 378.

³ VII, 638-39.

⁶ *Storia di Roma*, V³, 319.

⁷ *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege*, pp. 451-55.

⁸ *Epit.* xii.

⁹ Florus i. 8; Eutrop. ii. 10; Augustin. *De civ. dei* iii. 17. 2; Oros. iii. 22; Dion. Hal. xix. 13; Appian *Gall.* 11; *Samn.* 6; Dio Cass., frag. 39. 2 (Boiss.).

to investigate the ancient authorities once again in an effort to discover what is a more probable version of the events.

The most convenient method is to adhere to Mommsen's division of the authorities. We shall see that both the earlier and the later version contain serious difficulties. Let us begin with the earlier version.

According to it, in 284 the Senones attacked Arretium. The Roman στρατηγός Lucius (Caecilius) came to relieve the town but was defeated and slain. To take his place the Romans elected Manius Curius, who sent ambassadors to the Senones to treat for the recovery of the Roman dead. These ambassadors were treacherously murdered by the Gauls. Enraged, Curius then at once attacked the Senones, completely expelled them from Italy, and planted the colony of Sena Gallica on the territory vacated by them.¹⁰ However, this alarmed the Boii, who feared that they would share the fate of the Senones. Accordingly, in 283 the Boii joined the Etruscans and attacked the Romans, but were so heavily defeated at Lake Vadimon that only a few of them survived. Despite this, in 282 the Boii and the Etruscans, reduced to the expedient of arming even their striplings, again fought the Romans but were decisively beaten. They sought and obtained a peace, which they kept for forty-five years.¹¹

Beloch¹² has marshaled the points that deprived this version of plausibility. Later writers like Livy know nothing of the great victory of Manius Curius in 284. Yet M'. Curius Dentatus was the type of quasi-legendary hero to whom even fictitious victories would have been readily attributed by the popularizers¹³ on whom Livy so often depends. On this occasion, therefore, if Curius really did, as Polybius relates, win a victory in 284, either Livy or his sources have changed their ordinary procedure and suppressed all mention of it here. This is *per se* so improbable that it is better to argue that Polybius is here recording a victory so obviously fictitious that even the popularizers did not accept it.¹⁴ Nor is this the only difficulty in Polybius' account.

¹⁰ The implication of Polybius' phrase, *ἐκ χειρός* (ii. 19. 10), is that this too happened in 284.

¹¹ Polyb. ii. 21. 1.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 452.

¹³ As Professor Frank calls them (*Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, p. 174).

¹⁴ Cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

If the Senones really had been expelled and Sena Gallica planted as a colony so effectively in 284, how could the Boii in 283 have advanced, apparently with very little trouble, to a point so close to Rome as Lake Vadimon (it is near the borders of Falerii and Volsinii)? Like other citizen colonies, Sena probably had only some three hundred colonists (not three thousand as Professor Frank implies).¹⁵ But it was very strategically placed; as Polybius elsewhere remarks,¹⁶ it is the apex of a triangle whose sides are formed respectively by the Po River, the Apennine Mountains, and the Adriatic coast. Together with Ariminum, Sena is the key to Cisalpine Gaul;¹⁷ in fact, prior to the colonization of Ariminum in 268, Sena would be the Roman outpost against the Gauls. Therefore it is improbable that, if Sena had received its colony in 284, in the very next year the Boii would have been able to advance so far with such ease.

A third and no less telling point is that according to Polybius scarcely any Boii escaped death at Lake Vadimon in 283 ($\tauῶν \deltaὲ Βοιῶν τελέως ὀλίγοι διέφυγον$).¹⁸ Yet in the next year they had enough men left to put another army in the field—an army that amounted to ten thousand men or more if a later writer can be believed.¹⁹ Obviously, in the face of difficulties such as these we must be chary of accepting all the Polybian details.

Let us now turn to what we have styled above the later version. According to it, Sena Gallica was colonized *ca.* 290-289, in or just after the first consulship of M'. Curius Dentatus.²⁰ Thus, this later version also knows that Curius is somehow connected with the war against the Senones. Yet how could Sena have been colonized as early as 290-289? As Beloch points out,²¹ a colony foundation presupposes the prior conquest of the area receiving the colony. If the *ager Gallicus* had been thoroughly conquered by 289, how could Senones have been able to defeat the Romans at Arretium in 284 and advance as far as Lake Vadimon in 283?²² The 290-289 date for Sena obviously must be abandoned.

¹⁵ In *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, VII, 657. ¹⁶ ii. 16. 5.

¹⁷ As is proved by the Metaurus campaign in 207.

¹⁸ ii. 20. 3.

²⁰ Livy *Epit.* xi.

¹⁹ Frontin. *Strat.* i. 2. 7.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 452.

²² According to the later tradition; Polybius makes Boii and not Senones appear at Lake Vadimon.

The later version knows nothing of the events which Polybius assigns to 284. According to it, the fighting began in 283 when the Etruscans took up arms against Rome and hired the Senones as mercenaries. The Senones murdered Roman ambassadors and succeeded in defeating and slaying the praetor Lucius Caecilius in a battle near Arretium. But this defeat was avenged immediately in this same year 283 by the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella, who vanquished the combined Etruscans and Senones in a battle at Lake Vadimon.

Specific mention of the Boii and the fighting in 282 is not found in the epitomes of Livy. But that the later tradition also knew of those events is shown by two passages. Dionysius of Halicarnassus²³ says that the consul of 282, Q. Aemilius Papus, had the command in a war against the Etruscans: Κόιντον Αἰμίλιον τὸν συνάρξαντα τῷ Φαβρικίῳ καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τοῦ Τυρρηνικοῦ πολέμου σχόντα. This surely must refer to the war which Rome waged against the combined Etruscans and Boii in 282. Also in Frontinus²⁴ we read of *Aemilius Paulus* [sic] *consul bello Etrusco apud oppidum coloniam*, who almost sent his men into an ambush prepared by ten thousand Boii. Here, as has long been recognized, Frontinus has confused the names Aemilius Paulus and Aemilius Papus (even as in one passage the Elder Pliny confuses them).²⁵ Now, Beloch,²⁶ following a hint by Mommsen,²⁷ acutely observes that this cannot refer to the Aemilius Papus who commanded against the Boii in 225, for the war of 225 could not be described as a *bellum Etruscum*. Therefore Frontinus' notice, too, must refer to the events of 282, and in the words *apud oppidum coloniam* we get an indication as to the site of the battle. Beloch²⁸ follows earlier scholars in arguing that Frontinus' text is here corrupt and that the word *coloniam* should be emended into the name of some Etruscan town, e.g., Populonia, Vetulonia, or Statonia. The inference, then, is that the fighting of 282, like the fighting of 283, occurred in Etruria. But is interference with Frontinus' text necessary? If we retain the manuscript reading *apud oppidum coloniam*, the reference will naturally be to the colony that appears so prominently in the history of these years, viz., Sena Gallica. This town, of course, is not in Etruria at all;

²³ xix. 13.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 454.

²⁴ *Loc. cit.*

²⁷ *Röm. Forsch.*, II, 375.

²⁵ *NH* iii. 138.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 454.

but it is at the very point where the Boii would have to begin their attack.²⁹ Beloch's reason for preferring an Etruscan site for the battle is that he does not believe that Sena was planted as early as 282. He argues that the Livian epitome is correct in placing the colonization in Curius' consulship, but has named the wrong consulship. His suggestion is that the foundation of Sena really belongs to Curius' third rather than his first consulship, i.e., to 274 rather than to 290. Let us rather return to the ancient authorities. Polybius says that the colony at Sena was the immediate result of a clinching victory over the Senones (the name of the colony likewise indicates this). It is true that other ancient sources assign the clinching victory to 283 rather than to 284; but that it and the consequent colonization of Sena occurred in one of these two years seems as reasonably certain as anything can be in the history of this period. The implication of this fact is this: If we tamper with Frontinus' text and make the defeat of the Boii in 282 occur at Populonia, Vetulonia, or Statonia, we are once again faced with the problem of explaining how Gauls so easily slipped by the new colony at Sena to appear in threatening fashion in Etruria. To me it seems more reasonable to accept Frontinus' text as it stands and to argue that the new colony at Sena performed its appointed task: when the Boii and their Etruscan allies³⁰ attempted to advance they found their progress barred by a strategically placed colony. It was in the neighborhood of it that they were fought and defeated. So decisively were the Boii beaten that they sought peace and kept it for forty-five years. The probability of this version of the events being correct is enhanced by the fact that after 282 the Gauls really were no longer troublesome in these areas. This is proved by Rome's ability to colonize Ariminum a few years later (268).

To return now to the later version of the events of 284-282. We have already seen that its assignment of the colonization of Sena to 290-289 must be wrong. Even more incredible is the statement that in 283 Rome's army at Arretium was at first commanded by the

²⁹ *Ibid.* and Professor Frank, in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, VII, 639, both speak of the Boii as invading in 282. Polyb. ii. 20. 4, however, does not say that the Boii invaded; he merely says that they faced the Romans in the field (*παρέξαντο πρὸς Ρωμαίους*).

³⁰ These probably would be Etruscans who lived near the central Apennines, since the more southern Etruscans had been cut to pieces in the year before, if Polyb. ii. 20. 3 is to be believed.

praetor; it is only after the praetor's defeat and death that the consul appears. We might well ask what the two consuls were doing in the early part of 283. Why was the juridical officer, the *praetor urbanus*,³¹ in charge instead of the higher officers?

It is obvious, then, that the later version of the events of the years 284-282 resembles the earlier in containing anomalies that somehow must be removed. Now, if both the versions bequeathed to us by antiquity are to be distrusted, is it possible to arrive at any idea of what really happened in these years? I think that it can be done.

From our investigation of the confused accounts of this period which we possess, there emerge two facts which seem to be reasonably certain, viz., a Roman commander fell at Arretium and shortly afterward Rome won a victory at Lake Vadimon. Both versions agree that the Roman commander who fell was Lucius Caecilius Metellus.³² But it is in making a victory of revenge occur immediately after his death that both versions have become involved in difficulties. It is of course one of the commonplaces of Roman history that the tendency of the annalists of Rome was to balance every Roman defeat with a corresponding and immediate Roman victory.³³ Roman vanity demanded that a disaster to the arms of Rome should be at once avenged. Such naïve redressing of the balance of history can be seen in Polybius' account of the events which we are studying. He places Caecilius' death at the hands of the Senones in 284 and a revenge-victory over the Senones (which in his version is not the Vadimon victory) in the same year. This victory he ascribes to the great popular hero, M'. Curius Dentatus, and to it he attributes the colonization of Sena Gallica. But in making this concession to the psychological requirements of a Roman audience, Polybius or his source has been compelled to antedate the hostile appearance of the Boii and to represent them rather than the Senones as present at the Vadimon battle in 283. Thereby, as we have seen, results the difficulty of explaining how the Boii in 283 could have advanced to Lake Vadimon with Sena already a colony,

³¹ In 283 there was still only one praetor (Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II¹, 196).

³² The cognomen is given by Orosius *loc. cit.* Polybius merely calls him Lucius; Livy, L. Caecilius.

³³ Cf. the fictitious revenge-expedition after the Caudine disaster and my remarks in the *Jour. of Rom. Stud.*, XIX (1929), 13.

and how in 282 they could still field a large army despite their heavy losses in the year before.

The later version, like Polybius', also sees the rhetorical necessity of having Caecilius' death avenged immediately. It places his defeat in 283 and the victory over the hostile Senones (at Lake Vadimon) in the same year, making P. Cornelius Dolabella the conquering hero. The resulting difficulties of explaining how Caecilius and not one of the consuls was in command at first in 283 and of disposing of M'. Curius Dentatus, whom tradition associated with Rome's activities immediately after Caecilius' death, it resolves as follows. It styles Caecilius *praetor*. This is really not at all surprising, seeing that in the older annalists (and in Polybius too for that matter) Caecilius at the time of his demise was described as *στρατηγός*, which later was the regular word to translate the Latin word *praetor*. But not infrequently, even in Polybius,³⁴ *στρατηγός* means "consul." The tradition about Curius the later version explains away by retrojecting the foundation of Sena into his first consulship (290), since there is no room for him in its account of the operations in 283 following the death of Caecilius.

Now, it seems to me that we get rid of the difficulties in both the earlier and the later version the moment that we realize that it is due to Roman vanity, and to Roman vanity alone, that we have the story of a revenge-victory in the same year as Caecilius' death. The truth is that the Romans were defeated at Arretium in 284 but had to wait until 283 before they tasted the sweets of revenge at Lake Vadimon. Once we realize this, then we are no longer troubled by the appearance of a *praetor* at the head of Rome's army early in 283 (since the commander who fell was a *consul*—the *consul* for 284), nor by the premature appearance of the Boii (since the revenge-victory was at the expense of the Senones), nor by the problem of explaining how, after the colonization of Sena, Gauls could easily advance so far south as Lake Vadimon (since Sena was colonized after and not before the Vadimon battle).

The tantalizing appearance of M'. Curius Dentatus can also be explained. As we have seen, the later tradition dates the colonization of Sena *ca.* 290-289, i.e., in the consulship of Curius and P. Cornelius Rufinus. Such a retrojection could have been more easily effected if

³⁴ E.g., at i. 7. 12.

in actual fact the colony resulted from the operations of Curius and a P. Cornelius; the similarity of names would facilitate the displacement. Now, we know that on one occasion Curius obtained not a triumph but only an *ovatio*.³⁵ When was this occasion? Presumably it was some time when his arms were less successful than usual or when he was only a magistrate *suffectus* with whose status an *ovatio* rather than a triumph would be more in keeping.³⁶ At this point, let us ask ourselves to whom would the Romans naturally have had recourse after the disaster at Arretium, "perhaps the greatest that Rome had suffered since the battle of the Allia"?³⁷ Would it not have been to M'. Curius Dentatus, the hero of so many illustrious exploits only some five or six years previously?³⁸ If my reasoning here is sound, then, after Caecilius fell, Curius was elected in his place and for the rest of the year 284 held office without doing anything brilliant but also without incurring any fresh disaster. Then in 283 the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella gained the great revenge-victory at Lake Vadimon, as a result of which Sena was colonized. Thus, after Caecilius' death, both Curius and a P. Cornelius were in the forefront of the Roman operations that led to the colonization of Sena. Yet Rome's annalists felt that psychologically the revenge-victory was required in the same year as the defeat; also they doubtless felt that Curius' failure to do anything brilliant in the latter part of 284 was not the part worthy of so great a popular hero. Therefore they crowded the Roman defeat and the Roman victory into the same year (283) and also crowded Curius out. Thus at one and the same time the prestige of both Rome and Curius was preserved. However, Curius must not be deprived entirely of his share in the colonization of Sena. Therefore, since both Curius and a P. Cornelius had been concerned in the operations leading to that foundation, why not place it in a year when Curius and a P. Cornelius were consuls, viz., in 290?

After thus trying to point out and to smooth away the difficulties in the two extant versions of the history of these years, we may now summarize our results and give a connected account of the years 284-

³⁵ [Aur. Vict.] 33. 4 (the *De Lucanis* may be inexact).

³⁶ Cf. Münzer in P.W., s.v. "Curius" No. 6; Pais, *Fasti triumphales capit.*, p. 71.

³⁷ Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 454.

³⁸ For the mighty feats of Curius in 290 see Livy *Epit.* xi; [Aur. Vict.] 33.

282 that can be extracted by cautious use of both the earlier and the later traditions.

284. L. CAECILIUS METELLUS, C. SERVILIUS TUCCA COSS.

A combined army of Etruscans and Senones administered a defeat to the Romans near Arretium.³⁹ The Roman *στρατηγός*, i.e., the consul L. Caecilius Metellus, himself fell and the disaster was really a great one. In this crisis the Romans naturally turned to the tried hero, M'. Curius Dentatus, who was appointed *consul suffectus*. His duty was to keep the victors in check as far as possible, and apparently his defensive warfare was good enough to earn him an *ovatio*.

283. P. CORNELIUS DOLABELLA, C. DOMITIUS CALVINUS COSS.

However, as a result of their victory at Arretium the combined Etruscans and Senones, despite Curius, managed to advance as far as Lake Vadimon, where they were met by the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella. He administered a crushing defeat. The Senones were driven out of Italy and to prevent future Gallic inroads a colony was strategically placed at Sena Gallica.

282. Q. AEMILIUS PAPUS, C. FABRICIUS LUSCINUS COSS.

The Boii, however, either becoming uneasy at the fate of the Senones or being prevailed upon by the Etruscans, joined the latter, and attempted to repeat the Etruscan-Senonese advance of the previous year. But they found the new colony at Sena Gallica blocking their path, and it was there that the consul met them. He defeated them so decisively that they asked for peace, and kept it for forty-five years.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

³⁹ The story that the Senones murdered Roman ambassadors may be fictitious, its object being to place the Gauls irrevocably in the wrong. It is reminiscent of the slaughter of Roman ambassadors by the Fidenates in 438 (Livy iv. 17); or possibly the date should be 428 (see Last in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, VII, 507). The genuineness of the Fidenate story is vouched for by the unusual names of the slaughtered ambassadors (see Pliny *op. cit.* xxiv. 23), i.e., the names have not been conveniently "lifted" out of the *Fasti*. The fact that the names of the ambassadors allegedly slaughtered by the Senones in 284 are not given entitles us to be suspicious of the incident (cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 454).

THE PLACE OF THE DOG IN SUPERSTITION AS REVEALED IN LATIN LITERATURE¹

BY ELI EDWARD BURRISS

IT WILL be my purpose in this paper to present in systematic form and attempt to explain the superstitions about dogs recorded in Latin writers. The subject will be discussed under the following heads: (i) "The Dog in Rites of Aversion: The Scape-Dog"; (ii) "The Dog in Omens: Howling and Barking"; (iii) "Omens from Chance Actions and from Names of Dogs"; (iv) "Dogs and Corpses: The Taboo on Dogs"; (v) "The Dog in Witchcraft"; (vi) "Miscellaneous Superstitions about Dogs"; (vii) "Summary."

I. THE DOG IN RITES OF AVERSION: THE SCAPE-DOG

Among many peoples dogs are employed in rites of aversion, both in the popular religion and in the religion of the organized community. Because dogs drive away persons and animals which are harmful to their masters, they are natural instruments for driving away evils, whether real or potential. Parts of dogs are as effective for this purpose as the real animals. The mosaic or painted dog that greeted the visitor to an Italian house² may have been not merely decorative; it served, perhaps, to ward off evil spirits. In popular belief the gall-bladder of a black male dog acted as a talisman (*amulenum*) against harmful magic.

The blood of a dog, if placed under the threshold, kept away evil spirits, especially the spirits of the dead, which were believed to haunt the spot and which might harm the living members of the family.³

The tooth of a dog is a potent magical instrument; for in primitive thought the tooth of a dog is as effective as the dog itself: the sharpness of the tooth which rends things in actual life is transferred to the realm of the unseen. Thus it was believed that the tooth of a puppy

¹ T. S. Duncan has a paper, "The Weasel in Religion: Myth and Superstition," in *Washington University Studies* ("Humanistic Series"), Vol. XII; Otto Keller (*Die antike Tierwelt*) combines both fiction and science. Eugene Stock McCartney called my attention to these two studies.

² See Petronius *Satyricon* xxix. 1.

³ Pliny *Nat. Hist.* xxx. 82.

could drive away fears.⁴ A dog's left eyetooth was the best remedy for toothache.⁵ The longest tooth of a black dog could cure quartan fever.⁶ When a person suffered from earache, the ashes of the head of a dog that had died of rabies, when mixed with cypress oil and burnt without the flesh, was poured into the affected ear.⁵

The blood, teeth, urine, sexual organs, and the color black which appear in these rites are familiar magic instruments. The power of the color black, however, is not necessarily limited to aversion of evils. In times of drought, storm clouds and thunder may be secured by the sacrifice of a black dog.⁷

Live dogs, usually puppies, could be used as scape-animals. These, in the case of illness, were applied to the parts affected and over the whole body of the person. The disease or pollution passed to the dog, which usually died as a result and was buried in the earth or thrown into a running stream or cremated.

According to Plutarch,⁸ some Greeks of his day still used puppies in such rites. The persons who were to be cleansed were rubbed all over with puppies. In popular belief, a patient suffering from hidden diseases of the intestines could be cured by taking newborn puppies before they had opened their eyes and applying them for three days to the stomach and to the breast. These puppies died and the cause of the disease could be learned by dissection.⁹ Certain dogs called *Melitaei* were applied to the patient's stomach to relieve pains located there. The dogs became ill and generally died.¹⁰ For pains in the vital organs, a suckling puppy was applied to the offending part and pressed closely. Here, too, the patient believed that the disease passed over to the dog.¹¹

The skin of dogs was an effective remedy for disease. If the skin of a dog was tied about any finger, catarrh would be remedied.¹²

In the fourth century, Marcellus, a physician to the Emperor Honorius, collected a hundred remedies from the country people.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxxii. 137.

⁵ *Ibid.* xxx. 21.

⁶ *Ibid.* 98.

⁷ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (abridged ed.), p. 73.

⁸ *Quaest. Roman.* lxviii.

⁹ Pliny *op. cit.* xxx. 64.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 42.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 43.

¹² *Ibid.* 46.

Even in his times these specifics were considered ancient. One of them reads as follows: "Corregia canina medius cingatur qui dolebit ventrem: statim remediabitur."¹³ Leland¹⁴ cites a survival of this practice in Tuscany at the time of his investigations there. The person who was suffering from stomach pains took a dog's leash, bound it about himself, presumably at the stomach, and prayed that his pains might pass over to the dog and that he himself might no longer suffer. Although the lashing, familiar in such cases, is lacking here, still it is clearly a case of the transference of evils to a scape-dog. I have found two instances of the scape-dog in modern times. In Breadalbane,¹⁵ it was the custom on New Year's Day to take a dog to the door, give him bread to eat, and then to drive him away with a prayer that the death of any men and the loss of any cattle during the year might fall on the head of the dog. Again, when rain is needed in the mountain districts of Japan, the villagers go to a stream in a procession headed by a priest who leads a black dog. They tie the dog to a rock in the bed of the stream and riddle it with bullets and arrows. Having spattered the rock with the dog's blood, the peasants throw aside their weapons and pray to the dragon divinity of the stream to send them rain to cleanse the polluted spot. However, if fair weather is needed, a white dog is used. In the former case, the black dog not only induces rain, but carries away with him the evils of the community.¹⁶

Dogs were employed in rites of aversion at the *Robigalia*—the Festival of the Spirit of the Mildew—and in a rite called *augurium canarium*. It is not within the province of this paper to discuss at length the problems arising in connection with these rites.¹⁷ It must suffice merely to point out those elements which involve the principles with which we are concerned in this paper. Reddish puppies were sacrificed in the *augurium canarium*. From their entrails auguries were taken—a rite which, while it may have had an independent origin, probably was associated in historical times with the Festival of the Spirit of the Mildew. In the latter case, the *Robigalia*, the rite involved homoeopathic magic—a red dog to keep off the red mildew

¹³ Marcellus *De med.* xxviii. 39.

¹⁴ C. G. Leland, *Etruscan Roman Remains*, p. 293.

¹⁵ Fraser, *op. cit.*, XIX, 209.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* (abridged ed.), p. 73. ¹⁷ See J. G. Frazer, *The Fasti of Ovid*, III, 403–16.

and possibly also to bring the crops to ruddy ripeness. In ancient times, however, there was another explanation: Ovid, once, while returning to Rome from Nomentum, witnessed the ceremonies of the *Robigalia*, and on inquiring their purposes received answer from the sacrificing priest that the rites were intended to keep off the destructive heat of the Dog Star. Ovid writes: "This dog is set on the altar instead of the star dog, and its mere name is sufficient for it to perish."¹⁸ This statement shows the same psychology in the sacrificing priest that we find in the savage performing a magic rite. Because the star is called "dog," a dog in sacrifice will drive away the star and its heat—a process of homoeopathic magic.¹⁹

II. THE DOG IN OMENS: HOWLING AND BARKING

There is scarcely a nation that does not associate the howling of dogs with impending death. Intelligent people still believe that dogs have an uncanny sense of the approach of death.²⁰ We remember that the adjective *sagax* was regularly applied to dogs, that *praesagire* means "to sense in advance," "to forbode," and that witches were called *sagae*.²¹ The words *canis* and *catulus*, according to Varro,²² were given to dogs *a sagaci sensu et acuto*.

Among the Porto Ricans today the howling of a dog portends the death of some member of the family.²³ In Galicia the person nearest to the tail of a howling dog will be the first to die.²⁴ There are instances to be found in Latin writers: the howling of dogs, among other omens, presaged the death of Julius Caesar.²⁵ Among the omens which warned of the death of the Emperor Maximinus was the howling of twelve dogs about his tent.²⁶ Aristodemus, the king of Messenia, killed himself because, among other omens, dogs howled about his home altar.²⁷ The howling of dogs does not always presage death. Among

¹⁸ *Fasti* iv. 941-42.

¹⁹ Eli E. Burris, *Taboo, Magic, Spirits*, pp. 138-40.

²⁰ For an instance of this belief on the part of a famous modern physician and writer see E. S. McCartney, *Folklore Heirlooms*, in the "Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters," XVI (1931), 168.

²¹ Cicero *De div.* i. xxi. 65.

²² *De ling.* *Lat.* v. 99.

²³ See *Folk-Lore*, XXXVIII, No. 1, 63. ²⁵ Ovid *Met.* xv. 797.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

²⁶ Julius Capitolinus *Maximini Duo* xxxi. 2.

²⁷ I am indebted for this example to McCartney (see McCartney, *op. cit.*, p. 167).

the Kappiliyans, a girl remains infectious after her first menstrual discharge for thirteen days. On the thirteenth day, food is placed near her house, and a dog is allowed to partake of it. All the time he is eating, he is whipped. If he howls, the girl will be blessed with numerous children, but if he does not howl, she will have none.²⁸

Dogs give warning of the approach of dangers by barking. Hence they were used as guardians for temples. It is probably true that there was no religious or superstitious sanction for their being used to protect temples, but the fact that they were so used doubtless had the effect of lending to them something of the sanctity of the temple. Dogs were thus employed in the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline. The story goes that Scipio Africanus would often visit this temple late at night, ostensibly to consult the god about interests of state. He would remain in the temple unmolested by the barking and snapping of the dogs.²⁹ When the Capitol was endangered by the Gauls in 390 B.C., the dogs failed to bark. In commemoration of this failure and in honor of the sacred geese who gave the warning of the approach of the enemy, there was a procession from the Temple of Youth in the Circus Maximus to that of Summanus near by. They were accompanied by dogs affixed to fork-shaped poles. Their sufferings, as the ancients believed, were due to their having failed to bark when the Capitol was threatened.³⁰ The Romans may have been correct in attributing the crucifixion of the dogs to this cause. Frazer merely suggests³¹ that the Romans' penchant for cruel pleasures was responsible for it. I am inclined to believe that the dogs were, originally at least, scape-dogs.

When the poets Vergil and Horace describe magic rites which are intended to bring lovers together, the lover's dog usually barks—a sign of the approach of his master and of the success of the rite. This is, of course, a literary conceit, based on Theocritus.³²

Dogs may be prevented from barking, magically. Certain plants,

²⁸ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, X, 69.

²⁹ Gellius *Noct. Attic.* vi. 1. 6. The dogs had become used to Scipio and hence did not molest him. Gellius, however, considers it an omen.

³⁰ Servius on Vergil *Aen.* vii. 652; Pliny *op. cit.* xxix. 57.

³¹ *The Fasti of Ovid*, IV, 319.

³² See Horace *Epop.* v. 58; Vergil *Eclog.* viii. 107. These rites are based on the second idyl of Theocritus.

when attached to the person,³³ the ordure of a hare, and garments made from the hair of animals—presumably those which the dog does not fear—have the same effect. A pregnant bitch (*praegnus canis*) was ill-omened.³⁴

III. OMENS FROM CHANCE ACTIONS AND FROM NAMES OF DOGS

Occasionally dogs are concerned in omens which are significant not because of the dog but because of some accidental association with the dog. Once, when Emperor Vespasian was taking lunch, a stray dog brought in a human hand—a sign of power and strength—from the crossroads. From this and other omens, soothsayers promised Vespasian success in whatever he wished and planned.³⁵ In the year 458 B.C. some wolves on the Capitol were driven away by dogs. This was considered a *prodigium*, and the Capitol was lustral.³⁶

The Romans were superstitious about names,³⁷ especially those of their children. One instance where the name of a dog was ominous is familiar to readers of Cicero. Lucius Aemilius Paulus, on returning home after he had been appointed to carry on war against King Perseus, noticed, as he kissed his daughter, that she was sad. "Why are you sad?" he asked. "Father dear," she replied, "Persa is dead." Now Persa was the name of her pet puppy; and Paulus considered it an omen that Perseus, whose name was similar, was destined to die.³⁸

IV. DOGS AND CORPSES: THE TABOO ON DOGS

The persistent references in Latin literature to dogs' mangling the bodies of the dead lead one to believe that great numbers of dogs were allowed to run wild. In a passage in Apuleius³⁹ a robber, disguised as a bear, is attacked not only by the mastiffs that were let loose upon him but by a pack of curs from a nearby alley. The employment of dogs in religious rites, their putative power of aversion, their seeming prescience of death, their association with Trivia and with witches, may have caused men to leave them unmolested.

³³ Pliny *op. cit.* xxv. 126.

³⁵ Suetonius *Vesp.* v. 4.

³⁴ Horace *Carm.* iii. 27. 2.

³⁶ Livy iii. 29. 9.

³⁷ See McCartney, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-22; Cicero *op. cit.* i. xlv. 102.

³⁸ Cicero *op. cit.* i. xlvi. 103.

³⁹ *Met.* viii. 14; see also Cicero *Tusc. disput.* i. 45. 108.

Interesting stories were told about dogs and corpses. For instance, an accused astrologer once predicted that after his death he would be mangled by dogs. Domitian, who seems to have despised the man, was intent upon preventing the fulfilment of the prophecy, so he ordered him to be put to death at once, making the minutest preparations for his cremation and burial. A sudden storm arose and overturned the pyre. The dogs actually did tear the astrologer's body to pieces as he had predicted.⁴⁰

While dogs are employed in religious rites, they are occasionally harmful, probably because of their association with witches and with chthonic divinities. Thus among the taboos attached to the *flamen dialis* was one forbidding him to touch a dog.⁴¹ The Romans believed that neither dogs nor flies entered (*intransit*) the Temple of Hercules in the *forum Boarium*.⁴² In reality, it was probably a rule of the cult that they should be kept out. There are modern instances of this taboo. Among the Ibo people in southern Nigeria, the priest of the earth is not allowed to eat dog meat. If a dog enters his house, it must be killed and thrown out.⁴³

V. THE DOG IN WITCHCRAFT

It has been noticed in ancient as well as in modern times that dogs are restless when the moon is full. At such times they are given to baying. Inasmuch, too, as Italian witches prowled about and dogs bayed at the crossroads in the moonlight, there arose a sympathetic connection between dogs and witches and the moon. Witches were believed to possess the power actually to change themselves into dogs.⁴⁴ The Russian peasant of today believes that on the eve of St. George's Day wicked people transform themselves into dogs and cats, and suck the milk from the farm animals.⁴⁵

The incantation of witches resembled the howling of dogs.⁴⁶ Witches barked like dogs in rites performed to bring the dead to life.⁴⁷

⁴⁰ Suetonius *Domit.* xv. 3.

⁴¹ Plutarch *op. cit.* exi and Rose's note. ⁴³ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, X, 4.

⁴² Pliny *op. cit.* x. 79.

⁴⁴ Apuleius *Met.* ii. 22.

⁴⁵ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, II, 334.

⁴⁶ Lucan *Bel.* civ. vi. 688; Petronius *op. cit.* 63; Tibullus i. 2. 47; Ovid *Met.* xiv. 405.

⁴⁷ Lucan *op. cit.* vi. 729.

In Latin literature there are many references to witches and dogs. Tibullus, for example, once consulted a witch who was able to perform many extraordinary feats, among them taming the hounds of Hecate.⁴⁸ The witch in Horace's fifth epode used food snatched from the maw of a hungry bitch.⁴⁹ The barking of dogs was heard during Circe's magic rites.⁵⁰ The froth from the mouth of a mad dog was used in magic concoctions.⁵¹

Dogs regularly haunted the crossroads, for there they might obtain bits of food remaining from festival celebrations. Inasmuch as suicides were often buried there, it is more than likely that witches dug up bodies to secure parts for use in their nefarious rites. Witches attended by dogs regularly invoked Trivia at the crossroads.⁵² I believe that the association of the dog with the witches at the crossroads is the key to the understanding of their association with the Lares Praestites which were clothed in dogs' skins and had a figure of a dog at their feet.⁵³ The Lares Praestites were the legitimate guardians of the boundaries; Hecate and her hounds were their illegitimate counterpart.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS SUPERSTITIONS ABOUT DOGS

In the course of Trimalchio's dinner,⁵⁴ one of the guests, Phileros, describes the rise of the late Chrysanthus from poverty to affluence. Phileros says that since he has eaten a dog's tongue he must tell the truth about Chrysanthus. This remark has caused commentators difficulty. It may have been a bit of proverbial wisdom,⁵⁵ referring to the Stoics, one of whose cardinal virtues was truth-telling. The Stoics were often represented as dogs. A possible explanation lies elsewhere. We have seen that a part of a dog may function for the whole dog. Thus the tooth of a dog may protect one against evil influences. Similarly, the tongue of a dog may take over the powers of a dog, i.e., his ability truthfully to give warning of the approach of an enemy of

⁴⁸ i. 2. 52.

⁵⁰ Ovid *Met.* xiv. 410.

⁴⁹ L. 23.

⁵¹ Lucan *op. cit.* vi. 671.

⁵² Tibullus i. 5. 56; Horace *Serm.* viii. 33-36; see Kirby F. Smith's article, "Hecate's Suppers," in Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, VI, 565-66. The witches may have used these dogs to protect them against interference with the rites.

⁵³ Plutarch *op. cit.* li.

⁵⁴ Petronius *op. cit.* 43.

⁵⁵ See the note on this passage in Sage's edition of Petronius.

his master; the power ascribed to him, of warning of approaching death. In such superstitions it is not necessary to eat the dog's tongue; merely to say that one had done so is sufficient.

There are several superstitions about dogs' tongues recorded in Pliny the Elder. These, however, shed no light on the example from Petronius. Thus there was a belief that dogs would not bark at a person who carried a dog's tongue in his shoe under his great toe.⁵⁶

The following are general superstitions culled principally from Pliny the Elder. The blood of a dog was used as an antidote for poison,⁵⁷ and was an effective remedy for the itch.⁵⁸ The menstrual blood of a bitch was placed on a cloth under the patient's goblet as a cure for the bites of a mad dog.⁵⁹ The blood of a tick taken from a dog prevented the growth of hair.⁶⁰ A tick taken from the left ear of a dog when bound to any affected part will allay the pain.⁶¹ Warts could be cured by an application of dog urine and by the mud formed by it on the ground, or by the ordure of a dog mixed with wax.⁶² If a man urinated on a dog's urine, he would be deprived of his virile functions.⁶³ Dogs when bitten by a snake heal themselves by cropping a certain herb when no one is looking.⁶⁴ The milk of a bitch when applied directly to the skin will prevent the growth of hair.⁶⁵ Chilblains may be cured by the ashes of a burnt dog's head.⁶⁶ The flesh of a suckling puppy taken with wine and myrrh will cure epilepsy.⁶⁷ The ashes of a dog's head mixed with wine and honey will cure jaundice.⁶⁸ The matter vomited by a dog, if applied to the abdomen, will draw off the water gathered there.⁶⁹ Burns can be cured with the ashes of a dog's head.⁷⁰ A dog's brains, sprinkled on a linen cloth, with wool laid on the surface and moistened now and again, will cure broken bones.⁷¹ Pains in the side may be cured by sprinkling the ashes of a mad dog's skull on the affected part.⁷² Minucius Felix records an interesting superstition

⁵⁶ Pliny *op. cit.* xxiv. 99.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* xxix. 58.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* xxx. 121.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* xxix. 98.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* xxx. 134.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 83.

⁶² *Ibid.* 81.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 143.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* xxv. 91.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* xx. 46.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* xxx. 9.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 27.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 28.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 31.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 35.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 40.

⁷² *Ibid.* 41.

about dogs' connection with the *apagai* of the early Christians. After the Christians have eaten dinner, a dog is tied to a candlestick, and by offering it bits of meat it is encouraged to jump beyond the length of its leash. The candlestick in this way is overturned and indecency goes on in the darkness.⁷³

VII. SUMMARY

We have seen that dogs are used as scape-animals, by being rubbed over the persons, in rites of aversion principally outside the organized religion of the community, and that dogs (or parts of dogs—teeth, skin, gall-bladder, blood, urine, or even the picture of a dog), because they are able, actually, with their barking and biting, to drive away the enemies of their masters, are believed to possess also the power to ward off evil spirits, mildew, fears. They take upon themselves quartan fever, earache, catarrh, stomach and intestinal diseases; they (i.e., black dogs) bring rain in times of drought—they keep off the destructive heat of the Dog Star.

It is evident, from the examples given, that the ancients, like the savages of today, had a feeling that dogs possessed uncanny powers. This feeling may be due to actual observation of the actions of dogs in connection with things already conceived as uncanny. Thus, they howl at the crossroads when the moon is full; both the crossroads and the moon are uncanny things. Furthermore, their presence in the train of witches, their repulsive habit of mangling the bodies of the dead who have been cast aside, and their reputed prescience of death⁷⁴ added to their uncanniness. But other uncanny powers of the dog must be laid to the mentality which allows a part of a dog—teeth, blood, heart, caul, skin, urine—or the picture of a dog to function in the unseen world, which is full of dangerous forces. It is a slight shift from belief in the dog as an instrument of aversion to the belief that the dog itself receives the evils of the disease, pestilence, drought, famine. Hence the dog is an excellent scape-animal.

My references are in most cases neither Roman nor Italian in their origin; they are more often Greek or oriental or indeterminate. In my

⁷³ *Octavius* ix. 6-7.

⁷⁴ I am inclined to believe that the dog is disturbed because his master is not acting in a normal way; the master is strange to the dog, and hence the dog howls. The dog misses the wonted signs of affection, the command, and the food from his master's hand.

opinion, however, the significance of a superstition does not lie so much in the fact that it originated in Egypt or in Greece or in Persia or that it is to be found in a Greek or a Latin writer or in the books of the Magi as in the fact that it is part of the belief of man at a particular stage in his mental development, whether found in the records of the savage of today or in the lore of civilized nations of antiquity or of modern times. It is a psychological rather than a geographical matter. The superstitions which are found in Latin and Greek authors may be paralleled among the savages of today. They belong to a certain mental level, characteristic, theoretically, of primitive man and, actually, of savages. They may crop out in a reversion to the primitive, or in a survival of the primitive, in civilized man. Many of the allusions come from Pliny the Elder. It has been pretty well established that the magico-medical remedies, found particularly in Books xxviii-xxx, are derived from Greek sources. But that means little so far as superstition is concerned. More to the purpose is the fact that these remedies involve principles of unco-ordinated reasoning, characteristic of primitive man, of children, and of civilized man reverting to the primitive.⁷⁵

An instance of unco-ordinated reasoning which I have mentioned is to be found in Ovid's invective⁷⁶ directed against a former friend who had turned traitor. The poet represents the Furies feeding bitch's milk to his quondam friend when a baby. In consequence, as the story goes, the child was heard barking in the Forum. Similar instances are to be found among peoples of modern times. It is on record that the Indians of Kansas, before going to war, used to eat the flesh of dogs. The object, as they believed, was to give their warriors the sagacity and the bravery of the dog.⁷⁷

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

⁷⁵ I do not propose to venture at length into this matter here. For a full treatment of the view which I follow, see Dr. Marrett's Introduction to John Murphy's *Primitive Man*.

⁷⁶ *Ibis* 229-32.

⁷⁷ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, VIII, 145.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLAUTUS' ART

By JOHN N. HOUGH

THE plays of Plautus exhibit many differences both in the selection of models and in the method of adaptation therefrom. The technique of the latter also reveals varying degrees of skill. It is the purpose of this paper to analyze these differences in order to determine whether, by following a few hints of chronology, the individual changes will fall into a reasonable development. Such a development is in itself probable since it is unlikely that a prolific playwright during a literary activity variously estimated at from twenty to forty years should unswervingly pursue a single method throughout.¹ Some change, moreover, is proved by the existence of these differences. First I shall examine what evidence we have, and erect upon it a hypothetical course of development.

This evidence is of three kinds: the character of the Roman audience, the type of man Plautus was, and the types of differences in the plays themselves. It is beyond question that the Roman audience wanted farcical comedies with broad humor, emanating particularly from familiar-type characters, such as *lenones*, *parasiti*, *milites*, and unscrupulous slaves. It cared nothing for structural finesse, but only asked to be amused. Plautus was quite evidently a man whose chief dramatic purpose was to satisfy this desire. He was infinitely more popular than his successor, Terence, who, by placing art above popularity, produced the ill-fated *Hecyra*. Now there are a few plays of Plautus which do not fit the description given above of what the audience wanted. These (*Merc.*, *Capt.*, *Men.*) are much more skilfully constructed than the plays of intrigue and farce. The more popular type (as *Poen.*, *Miles*, *Epid.*, *Cas.*, *et al.*) betray varying degrees of patchwork technique. Should we believe that Plautus began with such work as this latter group, then mellowed in his later years to approach Terentian technique? If this seems probable at first, a moment's re-

¹ That a tremendous development took place in the mere six years of Terence's activity is strongly argued by Gilbert Norwood in *Plautus and Terence*, "Debt to Greece and Rome Series" (New York, 1932), pp. 121-76.

fection will show that nothing we know about Plautus conduces to this belief, nor indeed would it be the natural development for such a playwright.² It seems much more reasonable that he should have begun in the easiest way, i.e., by following his Greek models pretty closely; then, learning the preferences of his audience, he would begin experimenting with various methods of introducing more palatable elements. The natural result of this process would be to destroy the artistic skill apparent in the earlier plays (though it was but Greek skill retained in translation), and to produce the carelessness now so universally considered his main characteristic. But these were pioneer attempts (*Poen.*, *Miles*, *Stich.*), and in the course of time a natural increase in dramatic skill brought a greater facility in contaminating, curtailing, inserting, and smoothing over the rough edges of composition. We should not look, however, for the attainment of perfection, for Plautus, knowing always that the most important thing was to please the audience, never attained, nor I think did he try too earnestly, the skill of the Greeks or of Terence. However, even a Roman audience may have demanded a certain amount of continuity, and this, after his first rough efforts, he gave them in the large number of plays moderately well constructed, but which include the required farcical elements. Thus we have imagined three periods in Plautus' development, broadly outlined as early, middle, and late, characterized by plays of three types respectively: well-constructed non-farces, poorly constructed farces, and better constructed farces.

Now the dating of Plautus' plays has usually been considered impossible except for the two known dates, *Stichus* in 200, and *Pseudolus* in 191; every other dating is hypothetical, or dependent on references of varying dependability. But several lists of the plays have been made, based upon different criteria.³ Individually they may be open to criticism, but an amazing similarity pervades them all when one considers only roughly defined groups of early, middle, and late plays.

² It might be the natural development in modern times, when plots are at least supposed to be original. But where the accepted procedure is to adapt, and adapt closely, plays from another language, the situation is totally changed.

³ Cf. Sedgwick, *CR*, XXXIX (1925), 57 ff., and *CQ*, XXIV (1930), 102; Westaway, *The Roman Element in Plautus* (Cambridge, 1917); and especially V. Puttner, *Zur Chronologie d. Pl. Kom.* (Progr.; Ried, 1905-6) for bibliographical material, and references under individual plays in Schanz-Hosius.

I have treated this matter in detail elsewhere,⁴ and reproduce here for comparison a rough chronology, which I have used, not as a guide throughout, but as a scale against which to set the new grouping determined by the following analyses of technical differences according to my theory of the probable development of our author.

Asin.	Epid.	Truc.
Merc.	Capt.	Trin.
Miles	Rud.	Cure.
Poen.	Most.	Pseud.
Men.	Amph.	Bacch.
Stich.	Aulul.	Persa
		Cas.

A few words of explanation and caution are necessary before discussing the plays. Proven or extremely probable examples of *retractatio* are not considered in a discussion of Plautine technique. Such omissions are rare, however, for frequently *retractatio* is but a rival theory to some other practice attributable to Plautus himself. Second, the different methods of dramatic technique are revealed by peculiarities of structure rather than by the absence of them. Now since in a revival it would be the nonessentials which would undergo change, rather than the main element (deception and intrigue), we are more justified in treating difficulties of construction which affect these elements as probably Plautine. Third, it is too often forgotten that in the *Casina* it is definitely stated that many of the changes and omissions from the Greek original were made by Plautus himself (37, 64, 1013). This ironic fact, that our knowledge that Plautus actually did change and shorten his originals is derived from the only play which we know from contemporary evidence to have been produced after his death, should be a warning against attributing too much to later changes. One further consideration also warns us against too implicit faith in *retractatio*. The *Casina*, as we have it, contains a minimum of redundant and circumlocutory passages; yet it has always been such passages which have been attributed to retractators. Langen⁵ noted this

⁴ *AJP*, LV (1934), 346-64. In this article I arranged the plays according to the increasing skill with which Greek words are used by Plautus. This arrangement is the one here reproduced. It agrees in amazing manner with the lists of the three scholars referred to in the previous note. The *Vidularia* is omitted in both studies; the *Cistellaria* will be omitted from the present one.

⁵ *Plaut. Studien* (Berlin, 1887), p. 31.

condition in the *Casina*, but failed to draw the important inference: in this play at least the changes were those of condensation. This makes it even more probable that where difficulties caused by such passages exist, they were the work of Plautus, not later expansions, and that very often some difficulties of Plautine origin may have been struck out by later producers. I believe, then, that I am justified in treating the difficulties in the plays of Plautus as in general revealing his handiwork.

The words of caution are these: there were undoubtedly many local and individual circumstances, now unknown to us, which influenced Plautus at one time or another.⁶ Second, the degree to which an original was altered might easily throw an apparent development out of line; if, for example, after an easy and little-altered adaptation Plautus attempted to combine two ill-fitting plays, an increase in skill, though it may have existed, would not appear to the best advantage. With peculiarities of structure alone we cannot hope to set up a picture of his development. But it is the correlation of different types of peculiarities with different types of comedies which enables us to see the development of his technique. I do not presume to give an exact order for the plays, or to hold unflinchingly to the entity of the groups, but I believe that we shall be able to obtain a true picture, if in rough strokes, of the changes in his method of selection and adaptation from the Greek, that is, the development of his art.

The two outstanding non-structural characteristics of Plautine plays are slave-controlled intrigue and broad farce. Though these vary widely both as to prominence and as to method of presentation, a brief review will reveal a very natural correlation between them. The intrigue of the *Mercator* develops by itself under no conventional control.⁷ The *Menaechmi*, *Aulularia*, and *Captivi* have no planned

⁶ E.g., it is unlikely that the wide variation in the length of the plays can be due entirely to later alteration. Undoubtedly they were written to suit the length of time available for presentation under differing circumstances.

⁷ Cf. Norwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-99, wherein he lauds the *Mercator* as almost perfect, to the detriment of "the other nineteen plays." Professor Norwood considers the *Mercator* best because Plautus tampered with it least (p. 99), and praises the way in which "the difficulty [in the *Merc.*] brings about its own solution" (p. 41). This reminds one of the standards for Attic tragedy (cf. Arist. *Poetics* 1452a), which can hardly be used as a gauge for Plautus' art. Professor Norwood has little but contempt for the more

intrigue; the actions of the characters may affect the plot in detail, but have no part in its ultimate development. The *Stichus* is entirely devoid of intrigue. But in all other plays intrigue is the main element of interest (even to the exclusion of recognitions), centering in a slave (a *senex* in the *Trin.* and a coalition of divinities in the *Amph.*) who manages the plot against a *leno*, *miles*, or *senex*.

The broad farce is obtained by various means. With dialogue, one of the main devices, we are concerned here only when other devices are not used (e.g., *Bacch.*, *Asin.*, and *Cas.*, in which *senes*, usually more respectable, are made to provide humorous and burlesque effects). More often suitable characters are given prominent rôles: slaves (who appear in every play), and *lenones*, *milites*, *parasiti*, *meretrices*, *danistae*, and *sycophantae*, one or more of whom appear in every play except the *Amph.*, *Aul.*, *Cas.*, and *Merc.*⁸ In all other plays the characters bear greater or less prominence according to the nature of the plot. Those in which no humorous intrigue is engineered (as *Men.* and *Capt.*) give less prominence to these rôles, which in turn

usual "managing" of which Plautus is guilty, and for the windfalls, which I consider, far from spoiling the plot, rather added zest by testing the intriguer's ability to turn them quickly, or not at all, to advantage. Whatever our modern views are, can we say that Plautus should not have done this simply because modern taste prefers less obvious and less coincidental (opportune arrivals without sufficient motivation) development? Evidently we differ from the Romans to whom representations of instantaneous thinking was clearly amusing, and who cared little how these situations were brought about. Too seldom do we try to understand an attitude which cared less how something came about than how it would turn out. If tastes differ, there is no right or wrong. That Plautus' reputation could not rest on productions like the *Mercator* is obvious from the rest of his plays and from the evidence of his own admiration for the *Pseud.* and *Truc.* (Cic. *De sen.* xiv. 50), probably for the *Epid.* (*Bacch.* 214), and from the revival of the *Casina*. I cannot conceive of the Romans' reviving poor plays, as we sometimes do. Professor Norwood's judgment of Plautus as "on the whole the worst of all writers who have ever won permanent repute" (p. 4) is based upon a comparison with an ideal and with Terence, and seems manifestly unfair in not pointing out that it is possible to write skilfully and artistically even in a literary genre which is avowedly not so high as some other (i.e., Terentian comedy, which is quite another type of literature). If I am guilty here of defending an art "by an exhibition of the reasons for its badness" (p. 90), it is only to admit quite frankly that Plautus wrote what would please the audience. But one must also remember that an artistry such as that in the use of Greek words, and many other long-recognized Plautine excellences may be maintained even in such writing.

⁸ The *Cas.* and the *Amph.* are well provided with first-rate farce without these rôles, their absence being a necessity in the latter. The *Aulul.* is a special case to be discussed later.

present no such broad humor as do, by contrast, Curculio or Phronesium (*Truc.*), who are intimately bound up with the intrigue.⁹

It is clear, then, that farcical elements and clever intrigue generally coincide, and that in plays emphasizing these motifs we find characters of low social order prominently controlling the plotting or contributing to burlesque effects. Yet in a few plays (*Merc.*, *Men.*, *Capt.*) both elements are absent.

But there is another, and more important, characteristic common to non-intrigue, non-farcical plays. If we list those plays of which the structure is perfect, or so nearly perfect that it is impossible to postulate contamination or other drastic alteration, we find that these plays are included: the *Mercator* is finely constructed, the *Menaechmi* above suspicion, while of the *Captivi* it has only been suggested that possibly the rôle of the parasite was not in the Greek original.¹⁰ It is certainly more than a coincidence that these plays have three characteristics in common, all of which are rare in other plays of Plautus: (1) careful construction, (2) absence of broad humor, (3) no intrigue and consequently fewer characters of low social order. The significance of this will be clearly seen presently, after we have examined another group of plays.

Of the many plays featuring either slaves' intrigues or boisterous comedy, or both, there are three usually regarded as written comparatively early in Plautus' career. The *Stichus* is definitely dated in 200; the *Poenulus* and *Miles* have been frequently placed prior to the turn of the century. These plays, furthermore, have one important common feature: of all Plautus' work they reveal the most slovenly workmanship, so marked that many scholars have long regarded the latter two as *sicher contaminierte*,¹¹ whereas the *Stichus* is so loosely

⁹ Other prominent examples are *Balio* (*Pseud.*), *Charmides* and *Labrax* (*Rud.*), *Dordalus* and *Saturnio* (*Persa*); *Erotium* (*Men.*), though necessary to the plot, does not have the humor of the Bacchis sisters or Phronesium.

¹⁰ If this is true, it would only fit with our expectations that Plautus should add a comic rôle to a play otherwise devoid of the elements so admired by the Romans. E. Herzog (*Fleck. Jahrb.*, CXIII [1876], 363) holds it an addition whereas Th. Kakridis, an extreme exponent of contamination, suggests that it came from a second original (*Barbara Plautina* [Athens, 1904], p. 18).

¹¹ Leo, *Plaut. Foresch.* (1st ed.; Berlin, 1895), p. 153, n. 2. We cannot here review the voluminous literature on the *Miles* and *Poen.* A minority of scholars see more unity in these plays than is usually granted them. We are concerned here not with solutions but with the kinds of difficulties which exist.

and obscurely composed that few scholars have agreed on its origin.¹² But the most important point is not that they are probably contaminated, nor even their unusually loose construction, but the way in which their loose construction shows itself and affects the plot. All Plautine plays have some difficulties; these have many, and of a peculiar kind.

The plot of the *Poenulus* consists of getting two girls away from a *leno*, but when it is all planned and victory assured, the slave hatches an entirely new plot without even inquiring as to the success of the first. If it is objected that this is but an example of offering a new situation to test the quickness of the plotter, let us remember that the new plot is inspired, not by the sudden appearance of a new character whose arrival changes the situation (as Harpax in the *Pseud.*), but simply because of the unsolicited and hitherto concealed (for no apparent reason) information that the girls were freeborn. There is no reason why the first plot should not have been continued in spite of this discovery. Similarly in the *Miles* a second trick is clearly added to one which might well have gained the girl's freedom. There is nothing to explain why the twin-sister trick, so carefully planned, is never used. Without going into many other indications of contamination,¹³ we see that in both plays the alteration of the originals has had a deleterious effect upon the deception itself. If in these plays the actual method of deception is clear, it cannot be denied that at least the motivation for the second trick is shrouded in mystery. This is a unique situation in Plautus. The *Stichus* is little more than a succession of amusing scenes, shifting gradually from free characters to slaves. Whatever opinion one holds of the probable origin of this peculiar play, it is certain that every semblance of continuity is thrown to the winds for the sake of humor and burlesque. Evidently in these three plays Plautus was endeavoring to introduce more variation and excitement into the intrigue as well as a greater proportion of farcical

¹² All theories are variations of three fundamental points of view: Leo—contamination from three originals (*GGN* [1902], pp. 375 ff., and *Plaut. Forsch.* [2d ed., 1912], p. 168); P. Süss—a close dependence on Menander (*Rh. M.*, LXV [1910], 452 ff.); P. J. Enk—curtailment of one original (*Mnem.*, XLIV [1916], 18 ff.).

¹³ Even Fränkel, who believes the *Miles* otherwise not contaminated, agrees that the Lucrio scene was added. It is typical of the kind the Romans would like. Cf. Fränkel, *Plaut. im Plaut.* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 262-78.

elements. This he did, probably by contamination, but certainly by some kind of alteration and addition, in which he lost the thread of continuity and failed to re-establish it himself.

We have, then, two groups: one consisting of three plays with little farce or intrigue, lacking in rôles of boisterous character, and all well constructed; the other three, clustered in the years preceding 200, are the complete opposite of the first group in each respect. Knowing that it is easier first to copy than to adapt elaborately, and that the Roman audience enjoyed the type represented by the second group, it is certainly more reasonable to suppose that the simpler plays were the earlier, but that in answer to a demand for broader comedies, Plautus began to experiment with methods of alteration, to the detriment of structural excellence. I see no necessity for holding that the entire first group must have preceded the earliest of the second. Development of style does not take place overnight. Furthermore, we must remember that there were other plays to fill out the body of which we have only the skeleton. The small number by which we have to judge makes the differences in style loom large, for we may be jumping over several lost plays as we pass from one extant play to another. An undoubted overlapping in these changes, in addition to the influence of varying circumstances, previously discussed, precludes any exact chronological line between this or that type of play. It is therefore not disturbing to find the prologue to the *Captivi* presupposing earlier plays of scurrilous nature involving the very characters we have denied to the earlier plays, *periturus leno*, *meretrix mala*, *miles gloriosus* (57-58). Plays of this sort may well have preceded the *Captivi*; I merely hold that Plautus had not won for himself the reputation of writing such plays by that time. It is significant, too, that the *Captivi* itself contains a suggestion of Plautine re-working to suit Roman taste,¹⁴ or at least reveals deliberate care in Plautus' choice of subject; for the *Captivi* is certainly closer to the type represented by the *Miles* and *Stichus* than is the *Mercator*.

Before turning to the rest of the plays, we must treat the *Aulularia*

¹⁴ Cf. the rôle of Ergasilus and n. 10 above. For those who believe that *Capt.* 54-58 must literally presuppose scurrilous plays as the normal type, it is well to point out that there is nothing in these words to suggest that the earlier plays referred to were Plautus' own. It is by no means impossible that he was referring to the work of Ennius or Naevius.

briefly. The slave rôle and *anagnorisis* are little more than mediums for the expression of the chief subject, Euclio's character. A slight structural difficulty has been noted in the identity of the slaves, but it has no effect on the plot, and could scarcely betray an alteration designed to add interest for the Romans.¹⁵ The play is evidently an experiment in the character sketch, which Plautus, as far as our knowledge goes, did not care to repeat, and therefore gives no clue to its position in his development. It has usually been regarded as falling *ca.* 196,¹⁶ which, however, I regard as a little late because the very choice of a character study, subtle motifs, and its comparative purity of construction seem to suggest a closer connection with the higher literary values and greater finesse of Greek New Comedy as exemplified in the *Mercator* than with Plautus' later work.

The remaining twelve plays all emphasize broad comedy and intrigue. Their plots and selection of characters offer little on which to base further subdivision, but when we examine their structure, we note a great change from the *Miles*, *Poenulus*, and *Stichus*. Two, however, often considered as early in the second century, stand apart from the rest in that they bear significant traits of construction only less careless than the three plays above mentioned. Thus the suggested chronology supports the stylistic assignment to this period. It may be surprising at first to find one of them the *Asinaria*. Though infrequently suspected of contamination and not rich in the type of difficulties collected by Langen, this play has one very marked feature suggesting alteration quite in line with the purposes we have seen underlying Plautine art. It is all the more significant because in the early part of the play the plot and execution are simple, straightforward, and in startling contrast to this one difficulty. When the trick is over and the girl won, a new motif is suddenly introduced, the

¹⁵ The difficulty has been variously explained; cf. the summary by Schanz-Hosius ("Gesch. d. röm. Lit.", in I. Müller's *Handbuch d. Altertumswiss.* [München, 1927], p. 59). It is conceivable that an alteration was made with the purpose of introducing a slave intrigue into a character study. This fits well with what we should expect of Plautus, but it is excluded, I think, by the absence of the intrigue which would certainly be there had Plautus so intended. Even the mutilation at the end has no suggestion of a plot. The nearest thing is Strobilus' stealing the pot.

¹⁶ The date is conjectured by assuming that remarks such as 475-535 on feminine extravagance foreshadowed or were inspired by the repeal of the *lex Oppia sumptuaria* in 195. Talk of "repeal" for many years previous to its recent accomplishment shows how inaccurate such conjectures may be.

rival Diabolus, who engineers the subsequent, but quite unnecessary, humbling of the *senex*. This strange turn of events is foreshadowed only twice: once vaguely in a scene independently suspected of having been inserted, and the second time in a passage (634-38) in which the facts stated lie clearly outside the speaker's dramatic knowledge.¹⁷ Other circumstances connected with Diabolus are also highly suspicious.¹⁸ The construction alone suggests that Diabolus is an addition to the original, and the nature of the addition lends its support to the belief; it involves the blustering Diabolus (a strange character at best), his parasite, the amusing contract, and the final scenes of rich comedy—all peculiarly welcome to Roman ears. Whether it is an addition or not, the tone and construction of the play clearly recall the unskilled Romanizing of the *Stichus*, in method if not in degree.

The other play, the *Epidicus*, is harder to analyze, for it is of such unique construction that it is necessary to agree or disagree with the theory that the play as we have it has suffered seriously at the hands of retractors. If one denies this, he must account for the very worst construction of which Plautus was ever guilty; for the plot is not only awkward but, what is unique in Plautus, it is obscure. It has been shown, however, that much of the trouble was probably the result of later alterations.¹⁹ But the changes account only for the obscurity of the plot and the unexpected *anagnorisis*; the *Epidicus* is still left with definite Plautine alterations, motivated, it is true, more by the necessity of expunging a custom repugnant to the Romans than by the desire to introduce any new comic elements. The resulting awkwardness, nevertheless, suggests a period earlier than that of the ten plays next under discussion.

¹⁷ Argyrippus, after he has won the girl, reveals that a certain Diabolus would have taken her had he not. Elsewhere there is only the hint (230, in the suspected scene) that if "another" should produce money before Argyrippus did, the girl might go to that other. Diabolus' contract must then have been made somewhere between 231 and 634, which it manifestly was not. Later, when Diabolus appears, he is preparing a contract for hire. Later, still, there is no mention of any previous contract broken by Argyrippus' taking the girl. It seems probable that 631-38 were written by Plautus to prepare for a new motif.

¹⁸ Diabolus is angry at the wrong person; the introduction of the "night" stipulation for Demaenetus' help is most unusual; traces in the final scenes suggest a larger part for Diabolus who does not fulfil the functions of a "rival" as he is treated by Plautus. Cf. an abstract of a paper in which I hold the *Asinaria* to be contaminated (*PAPA*, LXIV [1933], lxiv).

¹⁹ A. L. Wheeler, *AJP*, XXXVIII (1917), 237-64.

In contrast to these five poorly constructed plays (*Miles*, *Poen.*, *Stich.*, and *Asin.*, *Epid.*), the ten remaining all deal with intrigue, broad farce, or both, are structurally much smoother, and are probably the productions of Plautus' last years. Though contradictions and discrepancies still appear, they no longer affect the clear and unmistakable development of the plot; the trickery and deception are lucid from every point of view. We are witnessing the final stage in Plautus' development; his skill in composition (or his pains, we shall never know which) has so increased that he would not leave the deception in as careless a condition as when he had first begun to construct plays by complicated processes. Some of these ten plays have more discrepancies than others, and though we may be tempted to see in their number evidence of earlier composition, the discrepancies are more probably merely those which were most difficult to dovetail. We have already been warned against separating plays which are the same in technique simply on the basis of the number of difficulties. So although the *Rudens*, *Casina*, and *Pseudolus* have probably undergone more drastic alterations than *Amphitruo*, *Bacchides*, *Curculio*, *Persa*, and *Truculentus*, and although these in turn are more unsatisfactory than the simple *Mostellaria* and *Trinummus*, no chronological division within this group is possible. For all these plays more than one solution has been offered, but it is useless to review them all here. What is of value to this study are significant examples which reveal how in dealing with the same situations Plautus' technique has changed.

The *Pseudolus* presents the combination of two plots almost as clearly as the *Poenulus* or *Miles*, but they are interwoven so carefully that the two threads, though visible at times, are hardly separable. The only discrepancy which affects the plotting shows the change from the earlier period. When one trick has been dropped in favor of a new one, we find two things: first, that the new trick is occasioned by a real and unpredictable change in the situation (the arrival of Harpax); and, second, that *Pseudolus* recognizes the changes and alters his plans accordingly (601-3).²⁰ This is an excellent example of how

²⁰ A detailed discussion of these lines and the immense significance they have, not only in the theory of contamination, but in determining how the original trick was developed, will be found in my dissertation *The Composition of the Pseud. of Plautus* (Princeton [Lancaster], 1931), p. 74.

Plautus might have manipulated the *Poenulus* and *Miles* but did not. Recent voluminous literature on the *Rudens*²¹ only strengthens the theory that the increasing difficulty of scholars to agree whether or not it is contaminated is the best proof that Plautus has constructed it more skilfully. For whatever solution one may prefer, the difficulties of this play cause no obscurity in the development of the plot.

The *Casina* has undoubtedly the loosest construction of any of the ten plays under discussion. The carefully prepared madness of *Casina* not only fails to materialize, but has nothing to do with the intrigue, although we are led to expect a close connection thereto. Nor is it explained away, as is the first plan in the *Pseudolus*. This, coupled with the extraordinary and certainly altered finale, would seem to vitiate the placing of the *Casina* in this late period. We must remember, however, that it has unquestionably suffered from *retractatio*, that these changes were certainly condensations,²² and that the difficulties, since they arise from this condensation, may not be serenely laid to Plautus. The play remains a problem, but it is not unlikely that in the process of stripping the play to its essentials, the retractors omitted some passages which might have cleared up this difficulty. Our interest in the *Casina*, however, does not stop here. Like the *Aulularia*, it may be an experiment which as far as we know Plautus did not repeat, for Leo has suggested that the finale was modeled on an Atellan farce.²³ Whether one accepts this theory or not, the end of the *Casina* shows Plautus ever reaching out after new and varied forms of farcical comedy, even in his later years.²⁴

²¹ F. Marx, *Rudens* (Leipzig, 1928); G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Altisches* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 3-104; H. Drexler, *Philologus*, Supplementband XXVI, Heft 2 (1934), pp. 40-114. Whether one agrees or not with her views, the analysis of the *Rudens* by C. C. Coulter (CP, VIII [1913], 57-64) remains the clearest and simplest statement of the problems.

²² Cf. the prologue and l. 1013. That Plautus used the madness is improbable because there are no other traces of it in the extant play. Leo (*op. cit.* [2d ed.], p. 208, n. 1) suggests that the madness may, in the original, have had something to do with bringing about the *anagnorisis*.

²³ Leo, *Die plaut. Cantica und die hellen. Lyrik*, "Abh. der Ges. der Wissenschaft," philol.-hist. Kl., N.F., Band I, Nr. 7 (Berlin, 1897), pp. 104-6. Cf. objections by Fränkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 312-13.

²⁴ The date of the *Cas.* has been variously placed from 210 to 186 for the first production, and 184-150 for the revival. T. Frank's date of 186 agrees most closely with the position of the *Cas.* on the chronological lists I have used (cf. Frank, *AJP*, LIV [1933], 368). For the latest suggestion (195) see Beare, *CR*, XLVIII (1934), 123.

The *Bacchides* marks a development from the time of the *Asinaria* in that the common feature of these plays, the appearance of supposedly respectable *senes* in ultra-farcical scenes, is handled in the *Bacchides* without the break in continuity of the earlier play. Again it is true that if this play is contaminated,²⁵ it only shows how much more careful Plautus' workmanship has become. In the *Persa* two parallel plots depend upon each other in a manner almost prophetic of Terence. If the *Persa* is contaminated, as some have thought,²⁶ it is strong evidence for this development of Plautus' technique, for there is no sign of awkward joining. Yet, even so, the play is not without value to this study. Comparison with the *Stichus* is natural; Sedgwick²⁷ has noted that in the treatment of the same themes Plautus shows a tremendous development in lyric technique, using this as one of his arguments for the late date of the *Persa*. It is also striking that whereas in the *Stichus* we saw the attempt to Romanize a Greek play by changing the emphasis from plot to farcical revelry²⁸ not very successfully accomplished, we have here, near the end of Plautus' life, the highly successful combination of the two elements, farce and intrigue. The *Curculio*, whether shortened or contaminated,²⁹ exhibits no difficulty in the development of the intrigue; its worst fault is the

²⁵ Leo, *Röm. Lit.* (Berlin, 1913), I, 110-20, holds contamination on the ground that three tricks contradict the Menandrian title, "The Twice Deceived." The problem depends on the definition of trick. The first deception is discovered and the *senex* loses no money; is it a trick? The second and third are really one, since, as Leo admits, they involve the same motif (the letter). It seems hardly sound to postulate contamination on the sole assumption that each of these must be regarded as a separate and distinct deception corresponding to the three stages on the siege of Troy (cf. *Bacch.* 925-79).

²⁶ Th. Ladewig, *Ueber d. Kanon d. Volcatius Sedigitus* (Neustrelitz, 1842), and A. van IJsendijk, *De T. M. Plauti Persa* (Utrecht, 1884), pp. 43-92.

²⁷ *CR*, XXXIX (1925), 51.

²⁸ A most suggestive remark appears in Sedgwick's article cited above. He wonders whether the *Nervolaria*, which Festus twice quotes with verses from our *Stichus*, may have been a later version of the *Stichus* with, since the fragments so indicate, more plot. The suggestion is admittedly conjecture, but is none the less interesting in the light of Plautus' development from the *Stichus* to the *Persa*. If the later version was Plautus' own work, we should have another example of the same development as the *Persa*; if it was the work of retractors who changed the title (cf. *Cas.*), it shows that they recognized wherein the *Stichus* was deficient, even as Plautus did.

²⁹ Most scholars prefer the theory of condensation and curtailment; cf. chiefly Ribbeck, *Ber. sächs. Gesell.* (1879), pp. 80 ff.; Leo, *Röm. Lit.*, Vol. I (1913), 145; Kunst, *Studien zur gr.-röm. Körn.* (Wien, 1919), pp. 165 ff. Contamination is held by Langrehr (Prog.; Friedl., 1893) and Kakridis, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

poor motivation for the appearance of the *miles*. Similarly, the *Truculentus*, probably curtailed from its original form,³⁰ is well constructed in spite of its disappointing plot. These plays well illustrate Plautus' growth of skill.

The *Amphitruo* presents a unique problem. The action is unquestionably clear; every effort is made to prevent the confusion of a long-continued double impersonation and the exceedingly farcical situations. Plautus' technique is as careful as we should expect in this stage of his development. The main contradiction appears, not between one part of the play and another, but between the play and the myth of Hercules as we know it. Whereas in other plays our problem is whether the changes we see, or think we see, took place at all, the problem of the *Amphitruo* is whether the shifting of the *nox makra* from the night of conception to that of birth, and the consequent telescoping of the action, had already taken place in New Comedy. If Plautus was responsible for this change (as Leo's theory of contamination requires), he exhibits a skill quite in accord with his growth. If one agrees with Professor Prescott³¹ that the alteration had already taken place in Greek comic writers, the problem, as far as it concerns Plautus' skill, does not exist. Though other incongruities produce other problems, they do not affect the clarity of action, and may be dropped from further consideration here.

Little remains to be said of the *Trinummus* and *Mostellaria*. The former offers no difficulty whatsoever, whereas in the latter the disappearance of Philematium is fully explained by a study of inorganic characters.³² Her function is to present a highly amusing scene which has nothing to do with the plot, but which was undoubtedly very popular. This function she fulfils completely. If she has served to make the play more amusing, she cannot be held as evidence for the

³⁰ Cf. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* (2d ed., 1912), pp. 206 ff.

³¹ Leo, *GGN*, (1911), pp. 254 ff.; Prescott, *CP*, VIII (1913), 14-22; and Leo's answer in *Röm. Lit.*, Vol. I (1913), 131-32.

³² Cf. Prescott, *op. cit.*, XV (1920), 245-81, and my discussion of Philematium compared to Callipho (*Pseud.*) in *The Comp. of the Pseud.*, pp. 65-67. Another point which has won criticism, especially from Professor Norwood (*op. cit.*, p. 98), is the strange manner in which Theopropides forgives all at the end. Two points, however, are overlooked: (1) the audience's interest in the play undoubtedly ceased with the intrigue; hence many endings are lame attempts at picking up loose threads (*Pseud. Rud.*) or just "stopping" (*Cas.*); (2) Theopropides is to be repaid.

omission of passages in which she would appear again. At any rate, she has and could have nothing to do with the intrigue, which is presented in a technique inferior to no extant Plautine play.

It has been stated that no attempt to divide the ten plays just discussed into a sequence would be made, but as a group their improved technique places them in contradistinction to the others. Reference to my suggested chronology, based upon a quite different analysis, will corroborate the assignment of them to Plautus' final period of development, for in that list they form, with the uncertain *Aulularia*, the solid second half of the corpus.

My conclusions have become apparent as this study has proceeded; it remains only to restate the relation of structure and chronology. Although the exact sequence of the plays will probably always remain a mystery, the lists taken from other sources and the order here postulated according to a logical development have, by their marked agreement, yielded evidence mutually corroborative. Research on single plays has too often ignored the few facts upon which we can rely, namely, the kinds of difficulties as opposed to their frequency and importance in one play. Only a comprehensive view of the entire corpus can extract from these facts any indication of Plautus' literary growth. If, as Sedgwick suggested, we should not attempt a criticism of Shakespeare without taking into account the chronology of his plays, it is to be hoped that the consideration of Plautus' dramatic composition in this light may aid in the appreciation of his technique as a definite progression. His gradual emphasis on and his efforts to introduce humorous characters, plots of intrigue, and broad farce left marks which he never completely eradicated and difficulties which he never fully surmounted.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

THE PSEUDO-MARIUS

BY ALBERT EARL PAPPANO

ON MAY 18, 45 B.C., as Cicero was resting at his Tusculan villa shortly after a visit from his friend Atticus, several men, apparently from the byways of the metropolis, brought him a letter bearing the superscription "C. Marius, C.f., C.n."¹ The writer, who claimed to be a grandson of the great Marius, seven times consul, begged Cicero, ". . . per cognationem quae mihi [Cicero] secum esset, per eum Marium quem scripsissem, per eloquentiam L. Crassi, avi sui, ut se defenderem," and appended a statement of the facts of his case. The relationship to Cicero which he mentioned was, to say the least, not close. M. Marius, a brother² of the old general, had adopted a nephew of Cicero's grandmother, Gratidia. For the rest, Cicero had written a youthful poem on the elder Marius,³ and had admired the eloquence of the orator Crassus. The fellow was pretty clearly a fraud. He claimed to be a son of the younger Gaius Marius, who had met his death at Praeneste in 82 B.C., and Licinia, the daughter of L. Crassus. But there is no record of a son born to this couple,⁴ and Cicero, who was in a position to know the facts, handled him, though diplomatically out of long habit, with evident distrust. The canny old barrister sat down immediately and answered that in his opinion Marius needed no attorney. Let him apply to his cousin Caesar (Caesar's Aunt Julia had been the wife of Gaius Marius the elder), who was then all-powerful in state matters, and who would surely let a relative sustain no damage. Cicero assured him of his best wishes and sent the letter off.

The real name of Cicero's correspondent is variously given: by Appian as *'Αμάτιος*, by Livy as C. Amatius, and by Valerius Maximus

¹ Cic. *Att.* xii. 49. 1 (Tyrrell and Purser, No. 597).

² Pauly-Wissowa, *sub nom.* "Marius," No. 42. Tyrrell and Purser (*ad loc.*) call M. Marius a son of Gaius Marius.

³ Cic. *De div.* i. 106 gives a thirteen-line fragment. Cf. Cic. *De leg.* i. 1, and Sihler, *M. Tullius Cicero of Arpinum*, p. 29.

⁴ Cf. Levi, *Ottaviano Capoparte* (Firenze, 1933), p. 47, n. 5, who seems to admit the possibility that he was an illegitimate son of the younger Marius.

as Herophilus.⁵ The editor of the *Thesaurus ling. Lat.* (s.v. "Amatius") puts the names together to form C. Amatius Herophilus, and inscriptional evidence bears this out as a probable name for a freedman. It may then be assumed that he had been a slave, Herophilus by name, belonging to some Gaius Amatius, and had been freed later, taking his master's name and affixing his own in the usual fashion. I think, however, that the possibility that he was a runaway and took his name, perhaps at random, is to be considered.⁶ A person of his apparent enterprise would hardly wait calmly for manumission. Valerius adds the information that he was by profession an oculist,⁷ and we may guess from his name that his home was somewhere east of the Adriatic. To lend any color of credibility to his claims the impostor must have been, apparently at least, somewhere between thirty-six and forty-six years old, for the marriage of his alleged parents had taken place in 92 B.C., and the death of the young husband is fixed at ten years later.

From Valerius⁸ we learn also that Amatius traveled about rural Italy visiting the *municipia*, formed of veterans of the old Marian army, where he was welcomed most enthusiastically—so much so, in fact, that they adopted him as their *patronus*, as did almost all the *collegia*, the workingmen's associations of Rome. Whether this jaunt through the country took place before the appeal to Cicero or during the ensuing summer we cannot ascertain.

Early in September of the same year the young Octavius on his way from Spain, where he had been campaigning with Caesar, to visit his mother at Rome was met on the Janiculum by a mob of the Roman citizenry, headed by the erstwhile eye-doctor.⁹ Conspicuous in the crowd were certain unnamed women of the house of Caesar who had become convinced of the genuineness of Amatius' claims. The im-

⁵ Appian *BC* iii. 1, 2; Livy *Epit.* CXVI—resting on an emendation of the impossible *chamates*, Val. Max. ix. 15. 1.

⁶ Cie. *Phil.* i. 5 may contain a hint of the truth in the word *fugitivus*. Quite possibly, however, it is mere oratorical vilification.

⁷ I follow Kempf, who in his edition (Leipzig, 1888) reads *ocularius* on the authority of the Codex Paridis and a marginal note to MS A.

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

⁹ Nicolaus Damascenus (*Vita Aug.* 14) gives a full and graphic account of the incident. Cf. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, I, 1, 49.

postor made a speech, addressing Octavius as a relative and earnestly entreating him to recognize their family connection without delay. The crowd clamored and the female relatives urged, but the young man hesitated. One fact alone was enough to make him wary: neither his mother Atia nor his aunt, her sister, were present. They did not accept the man as authentic, and they could be trusted on such matters. The whole situation was becoming exceedingly embarrassing. It was hard to repulse a person claiming to be one's relative, and especially so in the face of an enthusiastic crowd favoring the claimant. Then Octavius gave evidence of the consummate tact which distinguished him in later life. He answered "Marius" in the politest terms, expressing regret that the matter was beyond his decision and pointing out that Caesar as head of the family, not to mention the state, must have the final word. To Caesar, then, let him go, and state his case. If Caesar accepted him, they, the rest of the family, would be overjoyed to follow his lead; if not, they could not override the decision. In the meantime, in fairness to all, it was better that nothing be done on the basis of family connection. The plebs approved and applauded, and Octavius went on his way home, still escorted, however, by the not quite satisfied Amatius.

On September 13 or 14 Caesar arrived at Rome and in due course was acquainted with the details of Amatius' claims. Caesar came into personal touch with the pretender when he opened his gardens and received the populace to celebrate his victory over young Pompey. Amatius stationed himself in an aisle of the colonnade next to that occupied by the host and, according to Valerius Maximus,¹⁰ was surrounded by an admiring crowd of a size almost equal to that about Caesar. It is readily believable that this incident helped Caesar to reach a decision on his would-be cousin. To avoid any further embarrassing complications he decreed that Amatius should thereafter pursue his destiny outside the borders of Italy. Amatius withdrew.

A few short months brought the Ides of March and Caesar's sudden and tragic demise, and from that point the story of Amatius enters its catastrophic phase. From his place of exile he saw what Octavian and Antony did not fail to see: that Caesar's successor must stand or fall on Caesar's power, and that Caesar's power thereafter would rest

¹⁰ *Loc. cit.*

to a large degree on the recognition of his divinity. We see from Pliny's description¹¹ of the impression made by the appearance of the so-called "Sidus Iulium" that the lower classes were more than ready to recognize the new godhead, wanting only a leader. Therefore the continuator of Caesar's divinity would be gratifying the desire of the crowd, and hence would have strong support for the succession. As soon as news of Caesar's death reached him, the pseudo-Marius hastened back to Rome and again assumed the leadership of his huge plebeian following.¹² Before Octavian and Antony could determine on courses of action, Amatius' plans were well under way. He gathered the plebs about him and, as a relative of the dead ruler, demanded in eloquent and fiery speeches that his kinsman should not go unhonored and unavenged. With his followers he set up an altar on the site of Caesar's funeral pyre, and prepared to institute worship and sacrifice to Caesar as a god there.¹³ Then the bloodthirsty horde turned its attention to the conspirators and, as Appian says, became a perpetual terror to them. Some had fled the city; some, having accepted provinces from Caesar, had gone to take charge of them. Only Brutus and Cassius remained at Rome.

It was well known that Amatius was only waiting for a chance to turn his pack loose on these two, and the Senate was worried. If the murderers were to be lynched, what awaited those who had condoned the deed and secured a general amnesty for its perpetrators?¹⁴ Antony, for his part in the settlement of Caesar's affairs, and particularly for his speech against the conspirators at the funeral, was at that time in the extreme disfavor of the Senate. But here in the activities of the demagogue he saw his chance. The man was a public nuisance and it was up to him as consul (Dolabella was mysteriously in hiding, out of harm's way) to do something about it. Judiciously carried out, the

¹¹ *NH* ii. 25, where he quotes Augustus' *De vita sua*.

¹² Val. Max. *loc. cit.*

¹³ Appian (*BC* iii. 1. 2 ff.) gives an account of events after Caesar's death. Cf. Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, I, 1, 41, and nn. 31 and 32; also Holmes, *Architect of the Roman Empire*, I, 4, and n. 1. Mommsen (*Hist. Schr.*, I, 182) distinguishes this altar from one, or possibly two, other monuments consecrated to Caesar in the Forum; cf. Suetonius *Iul.* 85, and Dio *xliv.* 51. 1. See also Heinen's article in *Klio*, XI (1911), 133 ff.

¹⁴ Levi (*op. cit.*, p. 49) is, as far as I am aware, the only modern historian to recognize the potential danger of this plebeian uprising to the established order of the Roman commonwealth.

suppression of the impostor would provide good political capital and carry with it reinstatement in the favor of the conscript fathers. This, according to Appian, was the consul's governing motive, but the student of the period will remember that it was Antony's consistent policy to block the recognition of the divinity of Caesar¹⁵—a recognition which Amatius had been trying most ardently to promote.

On the strength of his consular authority, then, suddenly and without warning Antony caused the false Marius to be taken into custody and executed without trial of any sort. Cicero in a rhetorical account of those feverish days¹⁶ gives Dolabella credit for at least approval of the action, and adds the information that the victim was pierced with the executioner's hook and, inferentially, dragged through the streets to be thrown into the Tiber. Four of Cicero's letters to Atticus help us to approximate the date of the event. In one dated April 11, and written at Astura, he writes, "Ab aleatore φυρμὸς πολὺς. Nam ista quidem Caesaris libertorum coniuratio facile opprimeretur, si recta saperet Antonius."¹⁷ In another from Fundi, dated April 12, he says, "Expecto quid de Mario, quem quidem ego sublatum rebar a Cae- sare."¹⁸ Cicero is keenly interested in events at Rome, and is watch-

¹⁵ Taylor, *Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, pp. 87 ff. ¹⁶ *Phil.* i. 5.

¹⁷ *Att.* xiv. 5 (T. and P., No. 707). The Tyrrell and Purser note reads: "'A nice kettle of fish this, to be laid to the account of the Plunger,' that is, Antonius, who is naturally enough called 'the Gambler' by Cicero (see *Phil.* ii. 56). However there is no reason why we should regard *Antonius* as a gloss, because Cicero may have wished to explain to Atticus whom he meant by *aleator*."

Winstedt (Loeb ed.) notes as follows: "'A Balneatore' some MSS. and editors: in which case it refers to the Pseudo-Marius." But why should *balneator* refer to Amatius more than *aleator*? *Balneator* can be connected with nothing that is known about the man, while the latter term is, to say the least, an accurate figurative description. Then too the evidence for applying the word *aleator* to Antony brought forward by Tyrrell and Purser (*Phil.* ii. 56) shows only that Antony was fond of gambling—a common vice of his day. *Aleator*, referring to Amatius, however, well fits the sense of the first sentence, for his activities in Rome at that moment were such as amply to justify the epithet, the Greek phrase, and the assumption of the writer that his correspondent would understand whom he meant. This interpretation of course obviates any possible difficulty in the "Antonius" of the next sentence.

Cf. Scott, "Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.," *Mem. Amer. Acad. in Rome*, XI (1933), 32 and n. 6, on this passage; and on the prevalence of gambling, the same writer's "Another of Ovid's Errors," *CJ*, XXVI (1931), 293-96.

¹⁸ *Att.* xiv. 6. 1 (T. and P., No. 708). *Sublatum* in this passage is taken by Tyrrell and Purser to mean "put to death." ". . . The verb *tollere*," they admit, "is rarely used in this sense absolutely without some such pendant as *de medio*, or the instrument, as *ferro, veneno*;" Then *Fam.* xi. 20. 1. (T. and P., No. 877) and Persius iv. 2

ing with growing alarm the escapades of the mob-leader. In a third, sent as he was leaving Formiae, and dated April 15, we read, "Postridie Idus Paullum Caietae vidi. Is mihi de Mario et de re publica quaedam sane pessima. . . . Sed Brutum nostrum audio visum sub Lanuvio."¹⁹ The second sentence might conceivably refer to the killing of the impostor and the resultant disturbance among the plebs, but I think means only that his supporters were causing some danger to the state. When Cicero reached Sinuessa later in the day, he learned of Amatius' execution. Writing to Atticus then for the second time that day,²⁰ he said, "De Mario probe," and then with characteristically biting wit, "etsi doleo L. Crassi nepotem," harking back to the letter mentioned earlier, in which Amatius claimed Crassus as his grandfather. On the basis of the dates and places of sending of these letters, I should date the execution on April 14.

are cited in support of this interpretation. The interpretation of Persius seems to be correct, but let us examine the other citation more closely. D. Brutus writes to Cicero: ". . . ipsum Caesarem [Octavian] nihil sane de te questum nisi dictum quod diceret te dixisse 'laudandum adolescentem, ornandum tollendum': se non esse commissurum ut tolli posset." The Tyrrell and Purser note reads: "'A pointed remark which he said you made, that the young man should be lauded, applauded and exalted to the skies; that he will not allow himself to be exalted to the skies.' *Tollendum* is used in the double sense of 'to raise to honour' and 'to make away with': for the saying cf. Suet. *Aug.* 12., 'causam optimatum sine cunctatione deseruit ad praetextum mutatae voluntatis dicta factaque quorundam calumniatus quasi alii se puerum, alii ornandum tollendumque iactassent ne aut sibi aut veteranis par gratia referretur.' Vell. II, 62, 6, 'Hoc est illud tempus quo Cicero insito amore Pompeianarum partium Caesarem laudandum et tollendum censebat, cum aliud diceret aliud intellegi vellet.'

Tollendum is plainly used with double meaning, but the second meaning is not "to make away with," but "to remove," or "to push aside." In none of the ancient references to the incident is anything more violent mentioned, or even implied, and this interpretation seems to accord far better with the mild complaint of Octavian, and with his action as related by Suetonius. Moreover, it is hardly reasonable to assume that either Suetonius or Velleius would mention without strong comment a saying which he regarded as attacking the life of one whom he could consider only as a benefactor of the Roman people. J. H. McCarthy, in his "Octavianus Puer," *Class. Phil.*, XXVI (1931), 362—73, traces this rather disdainful attitude of Cicero toward "the Boy," and on p. 372 discusses this passage.

To return at last to the starting-point of the discussion, the letter of Cicero to Atticus, why should Cicero have thought that Amatius had suffered death at Caesar's hands? This penalty would have been out of all proportion to the offense, and apparently the banishment had been more or less public, for Valerius (*loc. cit.*) uses the words: "ex decreto eius [Caesaris] extra Italiam relegatus."

¹⁹ *Att.* xiv. 7. 1 (T. and P., No. 709).

²⁰ *Ibid.* 8. 1 (T. and P., No. 710).

Appian continues that the senators were astonished at the deed as violent and contrary to law but condoned it as expedient. We may suspect that the legal aspect of the case caused them no great concern. The plebs, however, the followers of Amatius, did not take matters so lightly. Appian says:

The henchmen of Amatius and the other rabble with them, in grief for Amatius and rage at the deed, particularly because it was done by Antony whom the plebs had hitherto held in high esteem, thought it an outrage that they be thus disdained. So taking the forum by storm they cried out cursing Antony and calling upon the magistrates to dedicate the altar in Amatius' stead and offer the first sacrifices to Caesar upon it. But when they had been driven from the forum by soldiers sent by Antony they became still more enraged and cried the louder. And some of them pointed out empty pedestals whence statues of Caesar had been torn down. And when someone told them the shop where the statues were being broken up and directed them to it, they went straight there and finding it they set it on fire. Soon, when more men had been sent by Antony, a number of the mob, resisting the soldiers, were seized and being placed under arrest some of them—as many as were slaves—were hanged, while the free men were hurled down from the Rock. Thus the disorder was quieted, but the indescribable favor of the plebeians toward Antony was changed to indescribable hatred.²¹

It was not without cost that Antony regained the favor of the Senate.

The death of Amatius linked him to Caesar as nothing in life had been able to. Both were friends and leaders of the plebs, martyred by the cruel oppression of the senatorial party. The breach between the Senate, trying to protect the conspirators, and the popular party, demanding vengeance for the murder of Caesar, was widened beyond hope of bridging. The arrival of Octavian at Rome and his assumption of the avenger's part turned the popular rage from the non-combatant Senate to the active conspirators in the East, and conflict at Rome was avoided.

The account of Amatius' meteoric career furnishes the only possible analysis of his character and peculiar talents. He must have been a man of no little poise, and at least moderately personable. He had some education—whether formal or self-acquired we cannot say—and a rich store of native shrewdness and insight. But his greatest natural gift was probably his eloquent and persuasive tongue, equally adapted to the demagoguery of a street-corner harangue or the in-

²¹ *Op. cit.* iii. 3. 7; cf. Holmes, *op. cit.*, I, 5.

gratiating syllables of a confidential tête-à-tête. Concerning his motives, speculation is useless. We can never decide with any probability of correctness that he dreamed of himself as Caesar's successor, or that he did not. It is safe to assume only that somewhere his plans held something of profit to himself. But say what one wishes of his motives, his birth, or his character, he must stand out as one of the first men of the Roman world acute enough to see, in some measure, the importance which the concept of a divine ruler was to assume in the subsequent political history of the Empire.

GRADUATE SCHOOL
WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
July, 1934

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

NOTES ON THE *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*

The following eight notes on points of text and interpretation in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* are based on an examination of the following editions and translations: Elmsley² (1825); Erfurdt-Hermann (1833); Dindorf (1836); Wunder, English edition (1854); Schneidewin-Nauck (1856); Blaydes (1859); Wolff (1870); Campbell (1871); Jebb³ (1892); von Wilamowitz, translation (1899); Storr, translation (1912); Sheppard, with translation (1920).

i. 132 ff. : ΟΙ. ἀλλ' ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς αὗτις αὐτ' ἔγώ φανῶ.
ἐπαξίως γάρ Φοῖβος, ἀξίω δὲ σύ
πρὸ τοῦ θαύματος τῆνδ' θεού ἐπιστροφήν.
ῶστ' ἐνδίκως δύεσθε κάμε σύμμαχον,
γῆ τῆδε τιμωροῦντα τῷ θεῷ θ' ἀμα, κτλ.

In the Prologos a priest ('Ιερέis), as spokesman of a band of suppliants, is engaged in dialogue with Oedipus when Creon enters on his return from Delphi, where he has sought to learn the cause and cure of the plague which afflicts Thebes. Questioned by the king, he declares the oracle's answer: that the murderer of Laius, still living on Theban soil, must be either slain or expelled. When Oedipus hears the oracle, he expresses surprise that the Thebans should not have tracked and punished long ago the murderer of their king; and Creon, answering as their representative, can only explain that the Sphinx put the fate of Laius quite out of their minds (87-131). Then at last, in line 132 cited above, Oedipus asserts his determination to clear up this mystery also, as he had solved the riddle of the Sphinx.

There follow lines 133 f., which Jebb correctly renders thus: "Right worthily hath Phoebus, and worthily hast thou, bestowed this care on the cause of the dead." All editors, and to judge *ex silentio* all manuscripts, assign these words also to Oedipus, so that *σύ* must be Creon. Now, the care which Phoebus "so worthily bestowed" on the dead Laius is evident; he gave an oracle that his murderer be slain or banished. But how can Creon be put on all but an equal footing (*ἐπαξίως*—*ἀξίως*) with Phoebus in this respect? Certainly not as representing the Thebans; for Oedipus has just expressed surprise that they had made no search. Hardly better as the bringer of the oracle; for Creon's part has been only the impersonal service of a messenger, who conveys indifferently whatever message is given to him.

Apart from Campbell's observation that "*ἐπιστροφήν* expresses sudden attention to a thing neglected" (which is inappropriate, since neither Creon nor the Thebans have yet had opportunity to show any *ἐπιστροφήν*), Sheppard alone seems to have felt explanation necessary. He speaks of the "tone of

reverent acknowledgment to the god, of quiet courtesy—as if by an after-thought—to Creon.” But if we bear in mind the slight part which Creon has played in concern for Laïus, and his previous neglect in common with all Thebans, which Oedipus has just censured, the courtesy reads only as a sarcasm. The *ἐπιστροφή* must be a voluntary act of the person who shows it.

I suggest that a different assignment of speakers suffices to give natural sense, thus:

ΟΙ. ἀλλ' ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς αὖθις αὐτὸν ἐγώ φανῶ.
 ΙΕ. ἐπαξίως γάρ Φοῖβος, ἀξίως δὲ σὺ
 πρὸ τοῦ θανόντος τῆρος θεοσθ' ἐπιστροφήν.
 ΟΙ. ὥστ' ἐνίκως δύνεσθε κάμε σύμμαχον, κτλ.¹

ἐπιστροφήν now has a proper reference to Oedipus' resolve in the preceding line; and the words of the priest, which express respectful approval of that resolve, agree perfectly in tone with the attitude of the Thebans toward Oedipus in this scene, who regard him as only less than the gods (cf. ll. 31 ff.: Θεοῖσι μέν ννον οὐν ισούμενόν σ' ἐγώ/οὐδὲ οὐδὲ παῖδες ἔξόμεσθ' ἐφέστιοι, / ἀνδρῶν δὲ πρώτον ἔν τε συμφορᾶς βίον/κρίνοντες ἔν τε δαιμόνων συναλλαγᾶς). With this division of persons δύνεσθε κάμε σύμμαχον means “Ye shall see me also (as well as the god) an ally of the dead man”; and σύμμαχον and τιμωροῦντα are an emphatic heightening of θεοσθ' *ἐπιστροφήν*. It may be objected that there could not then well follow “doing justice by the land and the god” (a difficulty which attaches almost equally to the vulgar reading of the text). But Phoebus appears under two aspects: as god of purity and light he is an injured party,² while as god of prophecy he is one of the avengers. Nor can it be made an objection that a one-line speech is thus interposed between the last but one and the last of a series of fourteen two-line speeches (ll. 106–31, 133 f.); for stichomythia and distichomythia frequently begin to break up just before the end, as, for example, we meet in this play with a three-line speech between the seventh and eighth members of a series of nine distichs (ll. 320–33, 337–40).

ii. 420–23: βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος οὐκ ἔσται λιμήν,
 ποῖος Κιθαιρών οὐχὶ σύμφωνος τάχα,
 δοταν καταίσθη τὸν ὑμέναιον οὐ δύοις
 ἄνορμον εἰσπέλευντας, εἴπολας τυχών;

The first two lines have hitherto been construed in one of two ways: either (1) ποῖος λιμήν οὐκ ἔσται βοῆς τῆς σῆς; ποῖος Κιθαιρών οὐχὶ σύμφωνος τάχα (ἔσται αὐτῷ); or (2) βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος λιμήν, ποῖος Κιθαιρών οὐκ ἔσται σύμφωνος τάχα; According to the second construe (so, after Matthiä, Erfurdt, Dindorf, Wunder, Schneidewin, Blaydes, Linwood, von Wilamowitz), Κιθαιρών stands by synecdoche for ὅπος, so that the sense is “What rocky bay of the sea, what mountain on land, shall not soon join in thy cry of anguish?”

¹ ὥστε thus begins an affirmative answer, as, for instance, at l. 1036; but it may be better nevertheless to write ὡς γ' for ὥστε.

² Cf. ll. 244 f.: ἐγώ μὲν οὖν τοιόσδε τῷ τε δαιμονι/τῷ τ' ἀνδρὶ τῷ θανόντι σύμμαχος πέλω.

(Schneidewin). But not only is this a forced way of saying "what place by land or sea . . . ?" but it deprives us, by generalizing Cithaeron into "mountain," of the tragic significance of that place for all Greek legend, and for the story of Oedipus in particular. Hermann, Campbell, Jebb, Storr, and Sheppard therefore adopt the former construe, differing only in that Jebb and Storr (absurdly) take *ποῖος Κιθαιρών* to mean "what part of the mountain C.?" while Campbell explains *ποῖος Κ.* *οὐχὶ* as *πῶς οὐχὶ Κ.* But apart from this difficulty,³ the translation thus obtained is unpleasing: "What place shall not be harbour to thy shriek, what of all Cithaeron shall not ring with it soon?" (Jebb). The stronger image of Oedipus wandering over the whole earth, so that all places echo his cries, is thus followed by a domestic reference to Cithaeron echoing them.

Better general sense and a proper meaning for *ποῖος* come by taking *Κιθαιρών* as common subject of both clauses, and construing thus: *βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος λιμήν, ποῖος σύμφωνος οὐκ ἔσται Κιθαιρών*; "What a harorer, what an echoer of thy cry, is not Cithaeron soon to be!" Thus is there from *λιμήν* to *σύμφωνος* such a rising of tone as the asyndeton and the anaphora of *ποῖος* suggest, while the interruption of the phrase *ποῖος σύμφωνος* by the subject *Κιθαιρών* serves to emphasize still more the top note, *σύμφωνος*.

iii. 463 ff.: *τις ὄντις' ἀθετέπεια Δελφοῖς εἰπε πέτρα
ἄρρητ' ἀρρήτων τελέσαντα φοινίασι χερσίν;*

On *εἰπε* Jebb has the following critical note:

εἰπε L. The letters *ει* are in an erasure, which would have been unnecessary if the word had been *εἰδε* [as Campbell believed]: it seems to have been *ηδε*. In one of the later MSS. (Γ) the 1st hand wrote *εἰδε*, which has been corrected to *εἰπε*. The Scholiast knew both readings; but it is hardly doubtful that *εἰδε* was a conjecture or a corruption.

It is difficult to see, however, how *εἰδε* could be a conjecture for the natural and easily understood *εἰπε*, and no state of Greek writing favors corruption of *π* to *δ*. Sheppard reads *εἰδε*, saying rather strangely in his note, "The MSS. evidence seems to me somewhat to favour *εἰδε*." Yet the sense thus obtained is less natural, and no other editor has deserted the vulgate.

But Jebb cannot be right in thinking that the first hand of the Laurentian wrote *ηδε*; for though the erasure is not very clear in the facsimile,⁴ the accent and breathing certainly do not stand in *rasura*, so that the word which the first scribe wrote must have been properispomenon. *ηδε* (= *ηδε*, imperfect of *άειδω*) fits both space and vestiges perfectly, and, if it was the true reading, would explain the origin of both variants: *εἰδε* as an inevitable itacism (Γ is perhaps derived from uncorrected L), *εἰπε* as a gloss. *άειδεν τελέσαντα* is no more difficult than *εἰπεῖν τελέσαντα*, and the word is a *terminus technicus*.

³ Wolff sought to avoid it by reading *πῶς σοι* by conjecture for *ποῖος*.

⁴ Facsimiles of the Laur. MS of Soph. with Introd. by E. M. Thompson and R. C. Jebb (London, 1885).

for the pronouncement of oracles (Arist. *Eg.* 61: ἔδει χρησμοῖς; Ameips. frag. 8: ὥστε ποιῶντες χρησμοὺς αὐτοὶ διδόοστε ἔδειν Διοπείθει; Thuc. ii. 8. 2: πολλὰ μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο, πολλὰ δὲ χρησμολόγοι ἦδον; 21. 3: χρησμολόγοι ἦδον χρησμοὺς παντοῖος). Though the verb ἀείδεν seems not to occur in the complete plays of Sophocles, it is cited from him by Hesychius (frag. 858 [Dind.]), and is used by Aeschylus at least thrice.

iv. 676 ff.: ΟΙ. οὐκον μ' ἔστεις κάκτος εἰ; ΚΡ. πορεύομαι,
οὐ μὲν τυχών ἀγνώτος, ἀν δὲ τοῖσδε ἴσος.

Sheppard translates the second line "You know not, pity not! These [the Chorus] trust me still, and know!" This is, in the context, beyond doubt the required sense. Oedipus is blind and unreasonable, but Creon feels sure that the Chorus believe in his (Creon's) innocence. But with the present text (1) there is a lack of concinnity, since the faith of the elders, not the innocence of Creon, is the proper antithesis to Oedipus' unreasonableness. Storr's translation reveals the difficulty ("By thee misjudged, but justified by these"), and to lessen it Blaydes suggested *ἴσων*. (2) *ἴσος* will not yield the sense "innocent"; it means *aequus*, "fair," "impartial," "honest," both everywhere else, and in the phrase *ἴσος ὁν ἴσοις ἀνήρ* cited from *Philoct.* 685 by those editors (Wunder, Wolff, Linwood, Jebb) who understand the passage this way. It was because they perceived this unsuitability of *ἴσος* that such good scholars as Erfurdt, Schneidewin and von Wilamowitz followed the interpretation of the scholiast: *παρὰ δὲ τούτοις τῆς ὄμοιας δόξης ἦν καὶ πρώην εἶχον περὶ ἐμέ*. This does justice to the sense of *ἴσος*, but leaves far too much to be understood, and is not altogether appropriate.

Since therefore Creon may not in any sense be called *ἴσος*, it is possible that the text originally ran: *σοὶ μὲν τυχών ἀγνώτος, ἐν δὲ τοῖσδε* *ἴσως* , and that after *ἴσως* a verse has been lost with some such sense as *οὐ παγκάκιστος ὡδε κέκριμαι βλάβη*. The change from participle (*τυχών*) to finite verb (e.g., *κέκριμαι*) is almost regular in Greek, and *ἀγνώτος* is better qualified to mean "misunderstood" than *ἀγνώς* to mean "misunderstanding"; the *μὲν* and *δὲ* clauses would also correspond better.

v. 717 ff.: παιδὸς δὲ βλάστος οὐ διέσχον ἡμέραι
τρεῖς, καὶ νιν ἄρθρα κείνος ἐνέβλεξας ποδῶν
ἔρριψεν ἀλλων χερσὶν εἰς ἀβατον δρός.

So does Iocasta describe the exposure of the infant Oedipus. Following a scholium (*τὰ σφυρὰ περονῆ συνάψας*), Jebb renders "Laius pinned its ankles together," and notes "ἄρθρα ποδῶν = τὰ σφυρά: ἐνέβλεξας, fastened together by driving a pin through them." So also all editors who have noticed the passage seem to understand it: Schneidewin, "Knöchel"; Wolff, "Fussgelenke"; Sheppard, "Pierced his ankles, fettered him"; so von Wilamowitz and Storr.

Apparently this interpretation arises from the parallel passage (Eur. *Ph.* 26.⁵ *σφυρῶν σιδηρὰ κέντρα διατείρας μέσων*) of Oedipus. But *σφυρά* is used

⁵ Seneca's *forata ferro vestigia* (*Oed.* 812) gives no clear indication, yet suggests that he conceived the soles of the infant's feet as having been pierced.

by Euripides metonymically for the feet as a whole: *βαίνουσα σφυρῷ κονίφω* (*Alc.* 586) and *σφυρὸν μονόχηλον* (*IA* 225); and the added word *μέσων* helps to show that in the passage of the *Phoenissae* this wider sense was intended. Sophocles' *ἄρθρα ποδῶν* may therefore be looked at without prejudice. Whereas to pierce the ankles would involve fearful and almost certainly incurable mutilation, the natural way to join the feet together would be by piercing the soles, and this sort of injury is indicated in the name Oedipus. The phrase should therefore be taken as periphrastic for *πόδες*, as *ἄρθρα τῶν κύκλων* (l. 1270) stands for the simple *κύκλοι*. There is a similar periphrasis at lines 1031 ff., where the mutilation is referred to again:

ΟΙ. *τι δὲ ἀλγος ἵσχοτε* ἀγκάλαισι λαμβάνεις;
 ΑΙ. ποδῶν ἀν ἄρθρα μαρτυρήσειεν τὰ σά.
 ΟΙ. οἵμοι, τὸ τοῦτο ἀρχαῖον ἐνέπεις κακὸν;
 ΑΙ. λίν σ' ἔχοντα διατέρους ποδῶν ἀκμάς.

Both phrases here Jebb again renders "ankles of the feet," "ankles"; but both are periphrastic. *ποδῶν ἀκμάς* means literally "extremities consisting of feet" (gen. def.), and is hardly a phrase which could be used of the ankles.

vi. 734 f. : IO. Φωκὶς μὲν ἡ γῆ κλῆσεται, σχιστὴ δὲ δόδες
 ἐς ταύτη Δελφῶν κάπε Δαυλας ἀγει.

Iocasta, who speaks at Thebes, is taking the point of view of Laïus as he traveled from Thebes to Delphi; at the fatal spot the way splits (*σχιστὴ δόδες*), and one way leads to Delphi, the other to Daulia; which is expressed by saying that the one leads from Delphi, the other from Daulia. No mention of a third way so puzzled the scribe of an ancestor of L that in the phrase *ἐν τριπλαῖς ἀμαξεταῖς* just above (730), where this spot is described, he wrote *διπλαῖς* for *τριπλαῖς*. But the third road is the road from (or to) Thebes, along which Iocasta is in imagination traveling. This situation has been understood, if never clearly expressed, by some earlier editors;⁶ but it is worth while pointing out Jebb's mistake, who identifies the Daulian road with that of Laïus, so that the third would be undefined ("Our path from Daulia . . . we are moving in the steps of the man whom [Oedipus] met and slew"), because an exact parallel can be quoted for this mention of two ways at a *trivium* and suppression of the third, along which the hearer is supposed to come: Plato *Gorg.* 524a: *δικάσονται ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι, ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἣς φέρετον τῷ δόδῳ, ἡ μὲν ἐς μακάρων νήσους, ἡ δὲ εἰς Τάρταρον.*

vii. ° ° 70: νόμοι ἰψίποδες ἀν Ολυμπος
 πατήρ μόνος, οὐδὲ νη
 θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων
 ξτικτευ.

⁶ E.g., Erfurdt: "Describitur locus ubi viae Delphos a Thebis ducenti alia ad Dauliam ducens se adjungebat." Von Wilamowitz' rendering leaves the situation at best obscure: "Wo der Weg von Daulis mit dem von Delphi her zusammentrifft."

I think the sharp point of this sentence has been missed. *νόμος* and *φύσις* are meant to be felt in contrast, as Athenians of Sophocles' day were accustomed to hear them contrasted by the Sophists. But the Sophists despised *νόμοι* as a convention which humanity, or, according to some, the weaker part of humanity, had artificially adopted for self-preservation, seeking thereby to hold in abeyance ruthless *φύσις*, with its right of the stronger, which the Sophists thought themselves the first to discover. Sophocles contemptuously replies that their *φύσις* is a poor, mortal, human thing, and that *νόμοι* have a being not inferior to it, as the handiwork of convention, but superior, as the eternal ordinances of heaven. Translations like "their parent was no race of mortal men" (Jebb) obscure this fuller meaning.

viii.

1470: Ήντι ὀνταξ;

1470: Ήντι ὁ γονή γεννάει, χεροί τὰν θιγάν

δοκοῦμ' ἔχειν σφας, ὥσπερ ἡρικ' ἔβλεπον.

τι φημι;

οὐ δὴ κλέων που πρὸς θεῶν τοῖν μοι φίλοιν

δακρυρροούντων, καὶ μ' ἐποκτείρας Κρέων

ἐπεμψέ μοι τὰ φίλτατ' ἐκγόνοιν ἔμοιν;

1475: λέγω τι;

ΚΡ. λέγεις· ἔγώ γάρ εἰμ' ὁ πορσύνας τάδε,

γνοὺς τὴν ταροῦσαν τίρψιν, οὐ σ' εἶχεν πάλαι.

ΟΙ. ἀλλ' ἐντυχοῦσις, καὶ σε τῆσδε τῆς ὁδοῦ

δαιμῶν ἀμενον οὐ μὲν φρουρήσας τύχοι.

All who give stage directions explicitly (Schneidewin, Wolff, Jebb, von Wilamowitz) mark after line 1470 the entrance of Antigone and Ismene, Oedipus' children, brought in by Creon's attendants at a sign from Creon; and no other opinion seems ever to have been entertained. But whether or not Oedipus could describe such an action of Creon with the word *ἐπεμψε* (l. 474), two considerations are decisive against this stage direction. After an earnest and impressive prayer to Creon that he may be allowed to hold his children, Oedipus might indeed express gratitude at its fulfilment, but not the violent astonishment of lines 1471-75. Moreover, Creon, if he had merely fulfilled an express request of Oedipus, could not take credit to himself for divining Oedipus' desire (l. 1477), nor would he need to declare (l. 1476) that he and no other had satisfied Oedipus' wish.

Both these traits are only intelligible if Antigone and Ismene enter originally along with Creon. The blinded Oedipus does not perceive their presence, but beseeches Creon to bring them to him. At that ^{fragment} (l. 1471), which would be of moving dramatic effect, a sob from the children, to whom their father's condition is most terribly manifested by his needless request, shows Oedipus that he has been asking for what is already present. Hence his astonishment that Creon has been so considerate, and hence Creon's complacency at having prevented Oedipus' prayer. If Creon brought the children with him, *ἐπεμψε* has a natural sense, and *τῆσδε τῆς ὁδοῦ*, which Jebb mean-

inglessly renders "this errand," signifies *τῆς ἡλιστεως σοῦ τε καὶ τῶνδε*. It will be best also to take *ποι* in line 1472 as meaning "somewhere near by," although in itself *οὐδὲ . . . ποι* is a possible expression.

J. ENOCH POWELL

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

AGAIN *HOC AGE* (PLAUTUS *CAPTIVI* 444)

In *Classical Philology*, XXVIII, 47 ff., Professor Rolfe calls in question my translation of *hoc age* in the volume presented to him by his colleagues (*Classical Studies* [University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931], p. 54). *Hoc age tu* is the reading from Plautus given by Ritschl while *Tu hoc age* is given by Goetz and Schoell, Leo and Lindsay; so the weight of authority on the textual side may well be said to be with the latter reading. The translation of *hoc age* as "mind this," "pay attention," or "do this," and "proceed" or "perform" (the sacrifice), as over against the translation "strike," has the overwhelming weight of authority on the linguistic side, as is shown by the very complete list of the instances of the use of *age* or *hoc age* in the sources, given by Rolfe in the above-quoted reference to *Classical Philology* and in his earlier note on the subject in *TPA*, XIV (1914), 39.

It is evident, therefore, that the translation "strike this bargain," *hoc (mandatum) age*, or "shake on it" of the "boy contract," appearing in nearly all systems of law, must be supported by legal evidence interpreted in accordance with reason, taking into account all of the facts of the particular case. We start with the assumption that every contractual obligation has two essential elements, namely, the consensus of the parties and the stamp of the law that makes the consensus enforceable by the tribunal. It is of course assumed that here, as in all bilateral transactions, there must be competent persons as subjects and an object to be attained of which the law approves.

Let us consider these two elements in the ritual contract described by Livy (*De urbe cond.* i. 24. 7-9), which was a contract between two peoples, the Romans and the Albans. The agreement is written on tablets of wax; the something that turns the agreement into an enforceable obligation is the blow with which the sacrificial animal is struck. Livy describes the climax of the sacrificial service with *porcum saxo silice percussit*. The verb that describes the stroke derived from *per* and *quatio* has the connotation of a piercing, riving blow as of a knife or ax. It is preserved by Gaius in the *aere percutit libram* in his account of the *mancipatio* contract (cf. *Inst.* i. 119), written nearly a thousand years later, during the Golden Age of Roman law.

The contract of the *XII Tables* (*Tab.* vi. 1), our earliest Roman code according to Sir Henry Maine, has no word such as *percutit* to describe the blow with a weapon, but it does say that when a man has made a *mancipium*, what he has announced by word of mouth becomes a binding obligation. *Mancipium* means a hand-grasp or stroke of the hands of the parties. It is the

essence of the contract just as was the stroke with the weapon in the ritual contract described by Livy. In the feudal period a sale is made binding when the buyer strikes with the right hand the palm of the right hand of the seller. Blackstone says that "anciently among all the northern nations, shaking of the hands was held necessary to the bargain." Vinogradoff describes a contract of Indian marriage as follows: "The bride and bridegroom concluded the agreement as to common life and perpetual union by giving the hand [*Handfastung*], described in Latin as *dextrarum prehensio*." In Scotch-Irish customary law a sale is perfected when "the vendee places a penny in the palm of his hand and strikes with it the palm of the hand of the vendor, the penny being transferred to the vendor in the process." The *Century Dictionary* says that "swat" is perhaps a variant of "swap." The *Oxford Dictionary* says that swap "signifies a smart, resounding blow." Swat is defined in identical terms as a "smart or violent blow." If this is true, it would appear that the *porcum percussit* of Livy and the *faciat mancipium* of the *XII Tables* are the validating marks of their respective contracts and that both are related to the "swap" that effects a conveyance and depends for its validity on the Anglo-Saxon "swat," or the Teutonic *Handsclag*, which accompanies it. The ceremony *mancipium* ("hand-grasping") of the *XII Tables* is therefore the exact equivalent of the *percussit* ("he struck") of the Livy ritual contract as the validating mark of a contract.

The Plautus folk contract (*Captivi* 444-46) is evidently the *mandatum* of the classical Roman system of contract. The fact that this contract was well known in the time of Plautus, when Roman thought was beginning to be influenced so much by the legal practices of the *jus gentium* brought in by the commercial contact of Rome with the Greek cities of Magna Graecia and, perhaps to a less degree, by the philosophic theories of the Greek *jus naturale*, might seem to indicate an easy transition from the *manu capere* of the *jus civile* to the *manum dare* of the *jus gentium*. The validating mark of this *mandatum* ("giving of the hand") is therefore identical with that of the *mancipium*, the contract of the *XII Tables*, which in its turn goes back to the *percussit* of Livy's ritual contract.

Look for a moment at what Plautus is portraying. Tyndarus says, "These things I beg of you [*opsecro*] by your right hand, holding you with my right hand, that you may not be less faithful to me than I am to you." Then comes the *hoc age tu*, "do you do this," i.e., "if you do this, you are my master, etc." As Tyndarus has just made an agreement ratified by the "hand-grasp," the validating mark of the contract of the *XII Tables*, which goes back in turn to Livy's *percussit*, he asks Philocrates to do the same—i.e., to pledge his faith and ratify the pledge by the "hand-grasp."

Rolfe says (*op. cit.*, XLV, 39) that "*hoc age (agite)* acquired two distinct meanings [and] it is probable that their origin was the same the former meaning attaching to the words when a victim was offered up; the latter when the worshippers were exhorted to look and listen." He says fur-

ther that the latter meaning was "by far the more common of the two." But he says also that the "two parts of the ritual meant in effect 'am I to strike?' and 'strike.'" He says at a later time (cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII, 49) that we have no example of *age* meaning "strike," and he refers to Ovid's *Fasti* i. 321 as proof:

*Qui calido strictos tinturus sanguine cultros,
Semper agatne, rogat, nec nisi jussus agit.*

But the *agatne* . . . *agit* here must mean either "do this" or "strike." The meaning "pay attention" which Rolfe says is the more common usage seems out of the picture at this point, and the meaning "proceed" or "on with the work" seems equally inappropriate. Does the one—whether he be *papa* or *cultrarius* (cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII, 49)—when he is about to stain the drawn knives with the warm blood say, "Shall I proceed?" or "Shall I do this?" Does he not rather say at this dramatic moment, "Shall I strike?" or "Shall I drive [the knife home]?"—if he wants to get nearer the dictionary meaning of *ago*?

Of course either of the foregoing expressions is possible in the Ovid passage, but in the selection from Plautus the "proceed" or "pay attention" seems impossible and the "do this" can mean only "strike this bargain," *hoc [mandatum] age*, which is the "shake on it" of the Plautus folk contract, appearing too in our boy contract.

If we are to descend to slang in the translation of this folk contract described by Plautus, isn't the "Put 'er there" to be preferred to "G'wan"?

JOSEPH H. DRAKE, SR.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE DATE OF CATULLUS LIII

The year 56 B.C. is usually conceded as a possible, or even probable, date for Catullus's poem liii which describes the effect which the poet personally saw created upon a bystander when Licinius Macer Calvus had concluded an invective against Vatinius. But I believe this to be erroneous, thus:

In telling Quintus of the acquittal of Sestius on March 11, 56 B.C., Cicero says:

I ripped Vatinius up just as I chose while heaven and earth applauded. Why even our friend Paullus announced when he was produced as witness against Sestius that he would denounce Vatinius in case Licinius Macer should delay, whereupon Macer arose from among the counsel for Sestius and promised that he would comply with Paullus' suggestion.¹

There is no extant evidence that he actually kept his word at all (and here the argument *a silentio* is more suggestive than under some other circumstances); if he did not, of course poem liii cannot refer to that year. If, however, he did

¹ *Ad Q. Fr.* ii. 4. 1. The statement of Schol. Bob. on *In Vatin.* 10, that Calvus had already commenced proceedings against Vatinius, is rejected by Hildebrandt (Teubner ed., 1907), p. 284, and by Stangl, p. 145.

fulfil his promise, he must have done so before the significance of the Luca conference was recognized. His attack on Vatinius and Cicero's attack on Caesar's Campanian agrarian legislation were of a piece in more ways than one, and if Cicero himself was abandoning the latter in late April or early May, it is scarcely likely that Calvus should have persisted in the former. In Cicero's case the word that Pompey and Crassus were at last on good terms,² and that Pompey and Caesar were still on good terms was sufficient, for matters went no farther.³ Deserted by Cicero (if one can assume such close connection between them), Calvus would scarcely have chosen to engage the Triumvirate single-handed! The precise date for the abandonment of his plan against Vatinius was certainly prior to May 15, the day when the Senate did not discuss the Campanian land, but actually it was probably nearly a month earlier,⁴ for any young man interested in preserving his own skin, either politically or literally, would not have been so rash as to attack Vatinius much after the days of the conference, about April 17 (i.e., March 25, Julian).⁵

It needs only to be pointed out that Catullus was in Bithynia until the spring of 56⁶ had "brought back its balmy warmth." But "pleasantly warm weather would begin in northern Turkey sometime in mid-April,"⁷ and we may be certain that even under extraordinarily mild conditions Catullus was still in Bithynia penning poem xlvi during the latter half of March (Julian), precisely when the Luca conference was in progress. If we add to this his plan of sightseeing among the famous cities of Asia—an intention which he fulfilled⁸—and his visit to Sirmio immediately on arrival in Italy, there is accumulated a comfortable margin by which he missed any speech hypothetically delivered in 56 B.C. by Calvus against Vatinius. That is, poem liii is not referable to that year.

On the contrary, it is certainly to be referred to either 58 or 54. The evidence on these dates has often been summarized by the editors of Catullus,⁹ but the further one investigates the claims of each date, the clearer becomes a

² Sanders, "The So-called First Triumvirate," *Mem. Amer. Acad. in Rome*, X (1932), 55-68.

³ Cary, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, IX, 533 f.

⁴ T. Rice Holmes (*Roman Republic*, II, 83) suggests that "the conference at Luca was still a secret" after its occurrence. I do not think so. One can scarcely speak in any sense of the "secrecy" shrouding a meeting of the three most powerful men in the world, surrounded by one hundred and twenty senators, besides other hangers-on among whom there were magistrates enough to display two hundred lictors.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

⁶ There is not, I think, much to support Ellis' contention that Memmius was praetor in 65. For the latest acceptance of the later date see T. Frank, "The Mutual Borrowings of Catullus and Lucretius and What They Imply," *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII (1933), 249-56.

⁷ For this statement I am indebted to the Philadelphia Weather Bureau, who add that "the temperature normals for Constantinople range from 41.4° in January and February to 74.5° in August. The altitude is 246 feet."

⁸ Poem iv.

⁹ See also Münzer in P.-W.-K., *Realenc.*, XIII, 429 f.

verdict of *non liquet*. The fantastic confusion of the essential sources, especially of the Bobbian scholiast on *In Vatinium*, is so great that it is not worth while to rehearse them merely to draw again the usual conclusion that 54 is the more probable date. The point at issue is that there is tangible reason for eliminating 56 from serious consideration.

HOWARD COMFORT

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

VERGIL'S MILITARY EXPERIENCE

It is a temptation which even competent scholars cannot resist to swell by any means the scanty information antiquity has left us about the life of so great a writer as Vergil. I believe this temptation has not been universally resisted upon one point at least: his military experience. Professor Tenney ✓ Frank,¹ for instance, although he expresses himself with some caution, is apparently quite convinced that Vergil served as a soldier on Caesar's side during the Civil War, 49-48 B.C. N. W. De Witt² insists more arbitrarily upon the same view.

Both Frank and De Witt follow Theodor Birt,³ the first to draw this conclusion as to Vergil's military experience from the sole piece of evidence yet presented in its support, *Catalepton* 13 of the Appendix Vergiliana. In his edition of the *Catalepton*, Birt ingeniously emends No. 13, making it in the process one of the most obscene lyrics for which classical literature and modern scholarly acumen can be held accountable, and, on the basis of the finished product, makes this assertion as to Vergil's military experience.

The greater share of Vergilian scholars have not been led astray, however. Among those who have declared against the view that Vergil ever served as a soldier may be mentioned Sellar, Teuffel, Schanz, Glover, Galletier, Mackail, Fairclough, Radford, and Prescott. Other scholars from Scaliger to Sommer, Naeke, Bährrens, Ribbeck, Némethy, Sabbadini, and Curcio either reject the entire group of the *Catalepton* or reject No. 13, and some (as Heyne, Némethy, Schanz, and Fabbri) consider this poem more worthy of Ovid, Catullus, or Horace. Fairclough, by a vocabulary test, finds No. 13 "absolutely un-Vergilian in diction, for in its 40 verses there occur as many as 24 common words which cannot be duplicated in Vergil. This is equivalent to the extraordinary proportion of 60 non-Vergilian words to 100 short lines."⁴

¹ *Vergil: A Biography* (1922), pp. 22, 24; *CP*, XV (1920), 116; *A History of Rome* (1923), p. 362; *CJ*, XXVI (1930), 3-11; in the last-mentioned article Frank shows more skepticism, holds much material in the *Vitae* to be "probable," and lays the burden of proof against the authenticity of the Appen. Verg. upon those who "still refuse to accept them."

² *Virgil's Biographia litteraria* (1923), p. 26; see also pp. 18, 21, 26, 38, 168.

³ *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils—Erklärung des "Catalepton"* (1910), pp. 18, 143 ff.

⁴ H. Rushton Fairclough, "The Poems of the Appendix Vergiliana," *TAPA*, LIII, 29-30.

The nine manuscripts in which the *Catalepton* are found are all, with the exception of Cod. Bruxellensis 10615-729 (B), of the fifteenth century. B, a twelfth-century *Mischhandschrift* as Birt calls it, must be supplemented by these later manuscripts. L. Varius and Plotius Tucca, in spite of Birt's blind adherence to the affirmative view, cannot be proved to have included these poems in their edition of Vergil, nor are they found in the major codices. There is no allusion to them in the *Vita* prefixed to the commentary by Valerius Probus, of the first century A.D. None of the ancient lives of Vergil mentions military experience; Vergil himself, although not entirely mute as to biographical details, says nothing elsewhere about such an important phase of his life.

Further points may be added in refutation of a view which year by year finds less to recommend it. One is the well-known uncertainty which prevails among editors of the *Catalepton* as to the acceptance and date of the various poems. Birt accepts all except No. 9; but he runs the risk in making this reservation of shaking the foundations of the entire collection.⁵ He supposes 13 to have preceded 5, which, as Fairclough points out,⁶ puts 5 late in Vergil's career, although the usual view assigns 5 to Vergil's sixteenth year. Birt's attempt to date No. 13⁷ is not an entirely happy one; he dates it (followed here by Frank) in 46, when, as has been held, the *collegia compitalicia* to which reference is made in line 27 were disbanded by Julius Caesar. John V. A. Fine,⁸ however, has recently offered more than plausible proof, based on inscriptional evidence, that Caesar did not suppress the *collegia compitalicia*; this certainly produces some difficulties in the acceptance of Birt's conclusion.

Prescott⁹ has a very reasonable suggestion as to the genesis and significance of No. 13. He does not take the poem literally as referring to actual military experience but as a defense, in conventional form and phraseology, against a taunt to the effect that the author of the piece can no longer follow Lucienus "in his infamous adventures."

Perhaps the most sensible conclusion of all was reached by E. K. Rand,¹⁰ who holds the poem "may contain after all a certain amount of reliable autobiography," but who says, "I hardly think we can venture more definite conclusions." He has since swung completely over to the view set forth in the present note in writing: "Virgil had not served in the army or the navy and his life had been singularly pure. . . ."¹¹

⁵ M. Schanz, *Geach. der röm. Lit.*, II¹ (1911), 104.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 18; "Nachträgliches zu Vergils *Catalepton*," *Rhein. Mus.*, 1910, pp. 345-51. Yet he states (what is the truth) that "Augustus stellte dann das Fest zwar wieder her" (cf. G. Wissowa, art. "Compitalia" in P.W. [1900], col. 792). The *compitalia* were still in existence in the fourth century A.D.

⁸ "A Note on the *Compitalia*," *CP*, XXVII, 268-73.

⁹ H. W. Prescott, *The Development of Virgil's Art* (1927), p. 40.

¹⁰ "Young Vergil's Poetry," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXX, 139.

¹¹ *The Magical Art of Virgil* (1931), p. 45.

Rand's interpretation still attributes the poem to Vergil; but, even so, there is no drastic necessity to assume, and to set down in textbooks used by many young students, the conclusion that Vergil served as a soldier. In view of the facts that he was always timid and retiring, that he hated war and understood little of it, that his health was bad, and that his position made it both likely and possible, he might quite as well have begged off from the military service theoretically required of every Roman citizen but actually escaped in a number of cases. It is quite reasonable to suppose, furthermore, that his health was broken before the period assigned as that of his military service; certainly it remained broken all his life. The scarcity of our knowledge of Roman military exemption, as well as the uncertainty of our entire acquaintance with the life of Vergil, renders dogmatic assertion unsafe; but I feel that this discussion throws strong doubt upon a belief which appears so alluring to some.

L. ROBERT LIND

WABASH COLLEGE

A NOTE ON NONNOS *DIONYSIACA* i. 69-71

καὶ δολέτις Βορέτις γαμίῃ δέδονημένον αὔρη
φᾶρος δῶν κόλπωσε δυσίμερος, ἀμφοτέρω δὲ
ξῆλον ὑποκλέπτων ἐπεσύροιτε δύμφακι μαζῷ.

—NONNOS *Dionysiaca* i. 69-71¹

Ludwich here accepts Köchly's emendation, based on a collation with vii. 199. But in the latter passage the reading is δέδονημένος, the same reading attested for i. 69 by LΩ. Köchly gives the following note in justification of his change from -ος to -ον: “δέδονημένος v.² quod si verum fuisset, scribendum foret γαμίῳ δέδονημένος οἴστρω. Sed vid. 7,199.” This seems too arbitrary a view; it implies the emendation of not one but three words, and is quite unnecessary. Marcellus reads -ος, placing a comma before γαμίῃ and after αὔρῃ, and makes good sense of the passage: “Le rusé Borée, enivré d'haleines amoureuses, enfile les plis de sa robe, et, rival jaloux, il murmure autour du voile de son jeune sein.” Köchly apparently considered the use of αὔρῃ as incompatible in reference to emotions; but in Eur. *Hipp.* 165 (cf. *Supp.* 1048), to cite only one instance, it is used in much the same sense as in the passage in question. δυσίμερος also lends weight to the reading -ος. It is certainly less strange a usage for Nonnos to say that Boreas, “the jealous lover,” is shaken with the thrill of love” than to say that he “puffed out her entire cloak, shaken with the nuptial breeze.” The passage is awkward enough to translate without making it more difficult by emending.

L. ROBERT LIND

WABASH COLLEGE

¹ Ed. A. Ludwich.

² Hermann Köchly, edition of the *Dionysiaca*, Vol. I (1857), Praefatio, p. xvi: “vulgo, h.e. editionum omnium atque codicis Monacensis consensum, nisi ubi varietas scripturae aut ex una editione aut e codice diserte notata est.”

ΠΑΝΤΠΕΡΤΑΤΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΖΟΦΟΝ

αὐτὴν δὲ χθαμαλὴν πανυπερτάτην εἰνὶ ἀλλὶ κεῖται
πρὸς ζόφον, αἱ δὲ τὸν ἄνευθε πρὸς ἡῶ τὸν ηέλιον τε [ι. 25-26].

The early commentators on Homer were wont to complain that the two adjectives that describe Ithaca in line 25 are contradictory—"low-lying" and "extremely elevated." They avoided the dilemma by rendering the latter word *extrema* and associating it with the *πρὸς ζόφον* of the next line, interpreting it to mean "the last [island] in a westerly direction." This is the usual understanding of the situation among more recent commentators and translators.

But is there any sound reason for joining *πανυπερτάτη* with *πρὸς ζόφον*? Certainly they are somewhat widely sundered in the sentence; moreover, we have no examples elsewhere in Homer of *πρὸς* or *προτὶ* being preceded by a superlative indicating direction or position. Also, for some reason that it is difficult to divine, Odysseus appears to draw, as it were, a zero-line—a Bronze Age Greenwich meridian—in the sea between Ithaca and the other islands. These latter are "apart," to the east; Ithaca alone lies west of it. Hence, *πανυπερτάτη* in the sense of "farthest" or (in the common translation that seeks to preserve the *-περ-* of the original) "farthest up" is both redundant and absurd.

If *πανυπερτάτη* stands here independently, what must be its meaning? Unfortunately, it is a hapax legomenon in Homer. We might learn the truth from the simple form *ὑπέρπατος* were it found oftener in the Homeric poems. In its two occurrences it signifies the topmost position, respectively, of a stone on a wall (M 381) and of a man in a place of public assembly (Ψ 451).

"Highest up" (of the islands, in relation to the horizon, as the scene is viewed from the shore) will hardly suffice for *πανυπερτάτη*. The islands could not have presented a "Pelion-on-Ossa-on-Olympus" appearance even to the most primitive of minds.

I have recently shown (*Classical Weekly*, XXIII, 167-68) that there is reason to doubt whether, in Homer, *χθαμαλός* ever bears the later meaning of "low" or "low-lying"; that in this passage and κ 196 it perhaps signifies no more than "grounded," in contrast to the "floating" island of Aeolus (κ 3). If, in any case, it denotes some other quality than "lowness," the difficulty is removed that lay in the way of granting to this Homeric *πανυπερτάτη* its later meaning of "loftiest of all."

The passage may then be rendered: "The island itself, the most elevated of all, lies grounded in the sea out toward the west." *Videtur significari Cephallenia.*

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

BOOK REVIEWS

Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie. By
HERBERT NESELHAUF. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXX [1933].) Leipzig:
Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Pp. vii+144.

This monograph merits the careful attention of all students interested in learning how recent attempts to reconstruct the so-called "quota lists" have affected our understanding of the Delian League and the Athenian Empire, for it is the first systematic and comprehensive study of the revised documents in their historical setting. In his effort to test rigorously and without prejudice currently accepted views about Athens and her dependencies, the author develops a number of novel theories worthy of critical examination. He writes forcefully, and with considerable historical acumen.

In the first chapter ("Von der Symmachie zur *ἀρχή*") Nesselhauf is particularly happy in his analysis of the situation which led to the transfer of the treasury to Athens in 454. On the other hand, when he finds reflected in the quota lists of the first four years weakness and discouragement at Athens so great as to allow island communities closely related to Athens, such as Chalcis, Eretria, and Imbros, to default in the payment of tribute at a time when a great majority of allied cities continued to make their contributions, he raises what seems to me a debatable question. In this chapter Nesselhauf discusses also Kimon's expedition to Cypros, its bearing on Athenian alliances in Caria, the peace with Persia, and the crisis in the affairs of the Delian League which followed the realization of one of its primary objectives. The issue was this: Were contributions for military and naval expenses to cease with the coming of peace in Asia, or was Athens to be allowed to keep the League together by force on the plea that eternal vigilance alone would serve to retain the security that had been attained? In this section Nesselhauf attempts to explain the peculiarities of the lists of the second period by reference to the expedition to Cypros, the Persian treaty, and the revolt of Euboea. Unfortunately, much of his acute reasoning possesses only academic interest, for it is based upon a misunderstanding of the character and dates of the so-called seventh and eighth lists—a misunderstanding which has been universally held since the time of Rangabé and Boeckh. Nesselhauf brings the first chapter to a close with a discussion of the Thirty Years' Truce of 446. Through this agreement with Sparta, Pericles' hands were freed to transform the Delian League into an empire.

In the second chapter ("Die Blütezeit der athenischen *ἀρχή*") Nesselhauf begins by analyzing the quota lists of the third period (years 9–11, 446/5–444/3) to show that the geographical division of the empire which is manifest

in Period IV was then established. Here he makes a number of useful suggestions. In his comments on the fourth period (443/2-439/8), he explodes the commonly held theory that the Samian revolt was responsible for permanent defections on the outskirts of the empire, particularly in Caria. He concludes rather that Athenian policy underwent a change after 440. Its aim, henceforth, was limited to the maintenance of a thalassocracy. Thus inland communities that had once been tributary were allowed to go their own way without fear of Athenian interference. In this manner Nesselhauf explains the disappearance of a number of Caric names from the quota lists of the next few periods. Despite the fact that he cites, for example, the coastal town Krya as evidence that inland cities were no longer pressed for payment of tribute, I am inclined to accept his thesis in a modified form. In fact, I think Nesselhauf might have gone so far as to question the propriety of restoring the name of the inland town Idyma in the list of 433/2 (*SEG*, V, 22; Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 56, l. 27). Idyma had ceased to pay tribute as early as 444/3. The correct restoration is of course [Νοτιὲς], for in the line above we find Κ[ολοφ]όνιοι. We must now substitute for [Νοτιὲς] in line 14 the name [Κρυὲς], for it is several times grouped with Καρβασναδὲς and Αἰλιάται. By these emendations we strengthen Nesselhauf's thesis.

In connection with the Samian revolt, it should be noted that the Ionian panel of the spring of 440 was appreciably shorter than it appears in *SEG*, V, 14. An important recent discovery, as yet unpublished, enables us to measure exactly the hitherto indeterminate lacuna at the top of the stele.

A section of Nesselhauf's second chapter is devoted to an interpretation of the appendixes which appear for the first time in the quota list of 434/3. He accompanies it with arguments to show that there had been an assessment in 435. In my opinion, his solution of these two closely related problems is far from convincing.

The third chapter deals with the early years of the Peloponnesian War. It too is highly controversial. At times Nesselhauf is in agreement with views expressed by Meritt in his *Athenian Financial Documents*, a book which came into Nesselhauf's hands too late for consideration except in a *Nachtrag*. At other times Nesselhauf's conclusions cannot be reconciled with Meritt's, as when he assigns an assessment to the year 431. On the whole, I think Meritt is to be preferred.

The last chapter ("Die Phorosänderungen von 454-431") attempts to fix the normal tribute of the first, fourth, and sixth periods. Comparison of his estimates with those compiled by Tod (*op. cit.*, p. 56) and Meritt (*AJP*, LV [1934], 286 f.) illustrate the difficulty of working with fragmentary material like the quota lists. In the first period Tod's estimate is approximately one hundred talents less than Nesselhauf's; even in the fourth and sixth periods, where more certainty is possible, they differ by twenty and forty talents. In general, these discrepancies are due to differences of opinion as to what items can be legitimately included in the normal quota of a given period.

Since Nesselhauf nowhere states clearly the principles that determine the inclusion of items not actually found in the quota lists of a given period, and since he frequently gives no indication that his totals include the tribute of cities not known to have been tributary at the time, the reader must collate Nesselhauf's tables with the quota lists in order to determine for himself whether Nesselhauf's premises are as axiomatic as his treatment leads one to suppose. It is true that Nesselhauf in the first chapter gives reasons for thinking that certain Nesiot communities were technically tributary, even though they paid no tribute during all or most of Period I. Since he includes their tribute in his estimated total for this period, we must infer that his figures represent the expectations of Athens rather than the actual receipts. With regard to this chapter, then, one must reserve judgment until a more detailed analysis is possible. This applies particularly to Nesselhauf's thesis that the rise in Thasian tribute from three to thirty talents in the third period was balanced by a number of reductions in the Thracian district amounting to twenty-seven talents. Similarly, Nesselhauf argues that reductions in the Nesiot panel were inspired, somewhat tardily, by a desire on the part of Athens to reduce the district total to the sum which the islands had contributed before Aigina began its payments of thirty talents.

In an Appendix Nesselhauf discusses the colonies and cleruchies sent out by Athens in the years 448-446. His conclusions, however, will need to be modified when the quota lists of these years are dated correctly. There is a good Index and a List of Inscriptions mentioned in the text.

In reading this monograph I was struck by the number of unsolved problems that still cluster about the tribute lists. Although Nesselhauf's solutions may not be all generally acceptable, his monograph makes many welcome contributions to our knowledge of these documents. Many of them will certainly be incorporated in the text of the quota lists when they are next revised. In conclusion, may I ask readers of this review not to be misled by my emphasis upon points of disagreement between Nesselhauf and myself into thinking that the monograph is of little value. They ought to read it for themselves, thoughtfully; then they can estimate its true worth.

ALLAN B. WEST

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Excavations at Olynthus, Part VI: "The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931." By DAVID M. ROBINSON. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. \$10.

Professor Robinson has published the coins from his excavations at Olynthus with a fulness and a promptitude which deserve the gratitude of numismatists. A volume on those from the season of 1928 is now followed by another on the season of 1931, so that all his material is now available not

only to specialists in the coinage of North Greece and Macedonia but to those whose interests are more general, to whom it is always important to have evidence positive or negative as to the dispersion of types not native to the Chalcidice. This second volume contains sufficient summary of the material in the first so that it may be used independently, while the additional evidence has made possible some new conclusions and valuable hypotheses such as the tentative classification of Chalcidic tetradrachms.

The desire for uniformity has evidently determined the author to follow the system used in the first volume, but it is doubtful whether the gain is worth the cost. It is an inconvenient book to use, both because of what it includes and because of what it does not. The descriptions of the individual pieces are obscured by extraneous material such as the inventory numbers and the place of finding (which surely should be published with the coin only when it has some numismatic significance) and by the habit of repeating identical descriptions in full with no emphasis on distinction of varieties. For example, bronze coins Nos. 206-387 appear to be all of one type (6½ pp. of them!), the only difference being the portion of the inscription preserved on each, recorded with meticulous superfluity. If this were the whole matter, it might be set down to mere extravagance; but there is a more serious charge against this section. Certain of the coins are so much smaller that they must be fractional pieces, as can easily be seen from the illustrations of two similar ones (Nos. 181 and 182) on Plate XIV. But there is no remark in the text to indicate that these smaller coins are a class by themselves, and they are not grouped together, so that one must go through the whole list to find that there are twenty-one of them. This raises at once the question of the system on which specimens of a single type are listed, if so important a distinction is overlooked. On examination it appears that the sequence of inventory numbers is the guide. This may be a convenience to the compiler, but is very little help to the reader. The separation of silver and bronze, the more remarkable separation of well-preserved bronze from poorly preserved bronze, the lack of any attempt at chronological arrangement in the body of the catalogue, and the somewhat hit-or-miss references to numismatic literature contribute to the difficulty of using the volume.

The coins as a whole do certainly give strong support to the theory that the site was destroyed in 348, and Professor Robinson is right in insisting that his critics should pay more serious attention to the important evidence they give. On the other hand, he himself has used them to prove what they do not: that the site was not occupied again until Byzantine times. This is the result of a very natural desire, which all excavators will recognize, to have an absolute terminus. If it can be determined that the town was deserted after 348 B.C., we have, of course, a highly desirable date to use for all the finds. But the appeal to the coins is not convincing. The first problem is to explain the one piece of Alexander (from 1928), the three of Antigonus Gonatas (Nos.

958-960), and the one of Doson (No. 961) whose dates are unavoidably late. The suggestion offered is that they were dropped by peasants or ancient visitors to the ruins. Of course, there is nothing unusual in the finding of such chance pieces, and the contrast between such representation for over a hundred years and the multitude of coins which the preceding half-century furnished is certainly striking. But it must be remembered that there was unquestionably a Byzantine settlement at Olynthus which yet yields only 15 coins for the eight-hundred-odd years from Valentinian to Manuel (not "Trebizond" as given on p. 2, nor "Thessalonica or Nicaea" as on p. 110). And of the 15, 9 were found in one cistern. Anyone familiar with the profusion of coins that a Byzantine site normally yields is likely to feel that the numismatic evidence supports a Hellenistic settlement quite as much as a Byzantine one. And the Hellenistic evidence is really stronger than appears. I have noted 16 other Greek coins that may be dated later than 348 in the opinion of such authorities as Head. In most cases they might also be before 348, but the only instance in which there is any attempt to argue the matter is on page 86. "Other examples of these coins from Myrina are dated as *circa* 300 B.C., but from their style it is possible to date them at least half a century earlier." Elsewhere 348 is assumed as a terminus, and the terminus having dated the coins, the coins are cited to confirm the terminus. This is a very dangerous kind of circular argument. If it could be determined on independent grounds that this site was unoccupied after 348, we should welcome gratefully the chance to precise our arrangement of fourth-century issues. But the fact is that the finding of a coin raises a presumption of occupation, and the presumption raised by those inconvenient Macedonian pieces is actually strengthened by every additional coin that may be dated after the supposed terminus. I have no desire to exaggerate the significance of this. Setting aside the hoards, 1931 produced 1,014 coins which are certainly to be dated before 348, and only 4 certainly Hellenistic, with 16 in dispute. It is evident that if there was a Hellenistic town it must have been a little and poor one, and undoubtedly the great majority of the finds can with entire confidence be dated to the first half of the fourth century. But I have dwelt on the question at length because I cannot feel that the evidence justifies the acceptance of 348 as a fixed point available for the absolute dating of the finds.

Of the illustrations it is impossible to speak with patience. Professor Robinson believes that photographs of the coins are more satisfactory than photographs of casts. He is entitled to his preference, but he must not expect numismatists to be polite about it, and the six plates devoted to halftones (!) of casts are not likely to make them any more genial. Few excavations can boast so high a proportion of coins in excellent condition as can Olynthus, and it is a great pity that the fine material should not have adequate reproduction.

ALFRED R. BELLINGER

YALE UNIVERSITY

Aspects of Athenian Democracy. By ROBERT J. BONNER. (Sather Classical Lectures [1932].) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933. Pp. 200. \$2.25.

When a scholar who has spent his whole life in the study and interpretation of Greek history and literature chooses as the subject of his Sather Classical Lectures so familiar a theme as "Athenian Democracy," his hearers, and readers, may well expect from him an exposition of his personal reactions to the aims and accomplishments of the statesmen and people who comprised Athenian society. These lectures, then, should be regarded as an *apologia pro vita sua*, or as a confession of matured faith. Thus we need not look for detailed discussions of controversial points or for an elaborate presentation of a novel thesis. Interpretation of Athenian government and society was the author's goal, not the preparation of an encyclopedic handbook to which one would refer for information about Athenian institutions.

Regarded as a whole, Professor Bonner's lectures reflect clearly a sincere admiration for Athenian democracy, sometimes qualified by admissions that its record was not entirely spotless, and by quotations from critics of the system. Eight aspects of the subject were chosen for special treatment. In the first chapter ("The Sovereign People") Bonner traces the development of the powers of the ecclesia and the electorate. Here the much-debated question of election by lot occupies a prominent place. In conclusion Bonner quotes from Pericles' idealization of democracy when it was at its best (Thuc. ii. 40), appending Aristotle's statement that "a multitude is a better judge of many things than any individual." Chapter ii, on the judiciary, continues the theme of chapter i, for in the administration of justice the people had supreme power. Bonner's many contributions to this phase of Greek polities make this chapter particularly his own. It is therefore significant of his point of view that he prefers Grote's praise of the democratic courts of Athens to the unsparing criticism of modern writers. The next chapter, on politicians, begins with a quotation from Pericles' famous funeral oration, and ends with a word of praise for the Athenian popular court as a medium for expressing prevailing public opinion. The intervening sections are crammed with information about orators, demagogues, ostracism, corruption of the electorate, litigation as a political weapon, sycophancy, and political clubs.

From orators—that is, politicians—Bonner passes naturally to freedom of speech, the subject of his fourth chapter. Here he is probably at his best, for the questions involved in the attempt made by Athens to safeguard the state without restricting the right of citizens to speak freely on public questions were largely legal. In Bonner's opinion Athens wisely insisted that the orators be held personally responsible for their public utterances; and he protests against the view of Walker that "the theory of political responsibility, i.e., the responsibility of the statesman for the policy he advocates, was imperfectly understood by the ancient mind."

The chapter on citizenship ends with this sentence: "It was this city, where men 'loved beauty and sought wisdom,' which Pericles said was 'the school of Hellas.'" The transition to literature in chapter vi is now a natural one. Although Bonner holds that political conditions have little to do with literature and therefore thinks it futile to discuss the dictum that the "tendency of democracy is to reduce all to the level of the average," he still insists that the "literary history of Athenian democracy, particularly in drama and oratory," supports "the view of Aristotle that the many are better judges of music and poetry than a single individual."

From literature he passes to religion, quoting Aristotle's admonition that in a democracy "every contrivance should be adopted which will mingle the citizens with one another," and concluding that the socialization of religion in the Athenian state was admirably fitted to perform this function. He points out also that sculpture, architecture, and dramatic literature, our greatest cultural heritage, were in large measure the products of Athenian religion. In this chapter Bonner has seen fit to discuss the problem of religious unorthodoxy as reflected in the career and trial of Socrates. His comments are illuminating, for though he condemns the execution of Socrates as a blot on the fair name of Athens, Bonner pictures him as an unrepentant nonconformist who had insulted grievously the "proudest body in Athens." Thus "in a sense the blood of Socrates was on his own head."

Although it may seem a far cry from religion to imperialism, the next and final chapter in the book is devoted to the Athenian Empire. Bonner is able to bridge the gap naturally, for he begins with the religious associations of Delos and the obligations of the allies to participate in several of the more important Athenian festivals. From this he turns to the use of imperial funds for the building of temples and the beautification of Athens. Despite the fact that Bonner, like Pericles, does not seek to justify that exploitation of subjects which is inherent in empire, he calls our attention to "one service of Athenian imperialism which has not been adequately emphasized." "For three-quarters of a century Athens kept the Aegean safe for democracy," and democracy, so Professor Bonner says, "seems to have suited the Greek political temper better than any other form of government."

The book is full of information gleaned from many sources; but possibly more valuable are the many intimate glimpses into Athenian life and thought which readers will get from the incidents and quotations so thoughtfully selected by the author. In reviewing a book of this sort, it is perhaps captious to call attention to minor faults which scarcely affect the thought. Yet one reader believes that our understanding of the Eleusinian tax decree is somewhat farther advanced than it was in 1880, when the decree was assigned to the period before the Peloponnesian War. He also has a preference for the third edition of Dittenberger's *Sylloge* as against the second; and for most purposes he regards the *editio minor* of the *Corpus* as more useful, and no less accessible, than the first edition.

I have been told that Bonner's *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* was included in a published list of ten books recommended for an ocean voyage. It is needless to add that the book is readable. Statements of fact, with few exceptions, are I believe reliable. As for the point of view, it is interesting to find in this age of "new deals" continued adherence to the doctrines of nineteenth-century British liberalism as so ably expounded by George Grote—a point of view with which one can readily sympathize.

ALLAN B. WEST

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Sallust als Historiker. Von WERNER SCHUR. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. iii+292. M. 9.

General recognition of the fact that Sallust raised the level of native historical composition above that of annals and memoirs, his undisputed right to a place among Roman historians of the first rank, and the importance of the period covered by his works (111-63 B.C.) have at all times made his writings an inviting field for the labors of scholars. No inconsiderable part of the results of their investigations has appeared within the last three decades. In the book at hand, despite its comprehensive title and length, we find only incidental treatment of such usual matters as sources, chronology, diction, and style. The author seeks to acquit Sallust of the charge, made in particular by Schwartz, "Berichte ueber die Catilinarische Verschwoerung," *Hermes*, XXXII (1897), 554-608, of writing with political bias and of being a partisan, who, disappointed in his public career, found in the apparently objective writing of history the means of waging a bitter struggle against the nobility.

Schur, following the lead of others who discover in Sallust's writings elements that are inconsistent with this view, attempts to show that Sallust, from earlier to later works, underwent marked change, that his aim was the renewal of the moral strength of his people, that his partisan tendency is no stronger than that of contemporary writers, and that he is withal a highly trustworthy source for the history of the period of which he writes. In support of this position Schur brings under analysis each of Sallust's works. Without reservation he accepts as genuine the two disputed treatises (*Suasoriae*) of the Sallust corpus, *Ad Caesarem senem de re publica*.

A brief outline of Schur's views runs thus: Sallust begins with a political treatise which in tone is marked by party hatred and disparagement of the Optimates; only the carrying-out of the program of the Gracchi and their followers can steady the ship of state. But even here there is observable a tendency toward a progressive development; the party politician at times reveals the historian's ability to represent past events objectively. Even before Caesar's murder Sallust is an adherent of Cicero's teaching about affairs of state; stoical thinking more and more wins over the political theorist; Sallust feels that the great task of a ruler is the reform of morals, on which alone the restoral of a republic can be based; gradually there matures within him

the plan of writing history according to the ideas of Posidonius, the great Hellenistic interpreter of the Roman revolution. In studying the conspiracy of Catiline, Sallust discovers that the account of it which has entered literature is one-sided and misses the chief lesson that it teaches; therefore his aim is to show that the ultimate blame for it is due to the moral depravity of the people as a whole, and especially of the ruling class. The brilliant success of the *Catiline* led Sallust to bring the beginnings of the revolution under investigation, resulting in the writing of the *Jugurtha*, the story of a war which reveals for the first time the corruption of the aristocratic party and checks its power; in this treatise Sallust gains a sense of independent thinking and clarity as to the complex issues of the revolution; thus having found his own system of thinking and his own style, he is ready for the *Historiae*, his greatest and most mature composition, which told of the restored republic of Sulla and its failure, the latter a result that brought about the despotic rule of Pompey.

In Schur's monograph there is a discussion of almost everything—historical, political, social, geographical, military—that has any possible bearing on Sallust's work and the time covered by it. Sallust's writings, of course, tell little directly of the author's purpose; hence for evidence Schur has free recourse to reasoning of the subjective kind and unmodified statement; if he has a doubt about anything at all, it is kept well concealed. The reviewer believes that Sallust's standing as a historian is not greatly damaged by the charge of political bias and that, even if it were, it would not be much improved by Schur's work. Sound criticism has long conceded to Sallust the essential virtues of historical writing: sincerity, breadth, unity, and excellence of form, a strong respect for the truth, and a high degree of impartiality considering his political convictions and environment. Sallust never worked on the level of a political pamphleteer, although he was a pronounced party man. In his yielding to partisanship he shares the company of ancient historians generally, whose aim, among other things, was to place nation, party, or cause in the most favorable light.

The book under review is entertaining but its importance scarcely matches its size. Perhaps the late famous editor of *Classical Philology* had something of this kind in mind when he said that in our field most books ought to take the form of articles and most articles the form of notes.

H. V. CANTER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. By P. REIS. Vol. II, Fasc. 4: *Brutus*. Teubner, 1934. Pp. xii+126. RM. 4.60. Vol. III, Fasc. 5: *Orator*. Teubner, 1932. Pp. xvi+105. RM. 4.

The rhetorical works of Cicero in the new Teubner series, which displaces that of C. F. W. Müller, have had a fortunate choice of editors. The new series begins with Marx's edition of *Ad Herennium*, which is labeled on the title-

page as the work "auctoris incerti." The *De inventione* was intrusted to Ströbel, undoubtedly the best-equipped scholar for this task. But Ströbel was sadly handicapped by the policy of the publishers, which dictated that the editors were to give *alles Wesentliche* but were to omit *quisquiliae*, whatever that means. Consequently Ströbel's Introduction and critical apparatus, having been subjected to a twofold abridgment, prove quite inadequate. Their present form is far from doing justice to a lifetime's study of the MSS and the Latinity of this text and, as a result, much of Ströbel's work is lost to scholarship. Fortunately, in the case of the *Brutus* and the *Orator*, edited by Reis, the publishers' restrictions have not been so serious.

The text of the *Brutus* has come down to us solely through the lost Codex Laudensis. From the studies of Heerdegen, Stangl, Reis, Meister, Martin, Sabbadini, and others, climaxed by the masterly analysis of the evidence by Stroux, we now know about all that we can hope to learn in regard to this codex. The only new light which we can expect for the text must come from the *Testimonia*. Reis prints the passages from the ancient authors and cites them in his apparatus, but without comment; whereas we should have welcomed a statement in the Introduction as to his attitude toward them. Ströbel was skeptical of their value for the text.

For the *Orator*, in addition to the *Laudensis*, we have the ninth-century Avranches Codex, which contains also *De oratore*. For this MS Reis seems to have depended on Heerdegen, who made a careful collation in preparing his edition of the *Orator* (Teubner, 1885). There is no discussion in Reis's Preface of the relative value of the two families of MSS or their relationship. Do they represent independent traditions which go back to ancient times or, as Martin suggested, was the *Laudensis* a *codex expletus*, i.e., was it descended from a *codex mutilus* with the missing parts supplied from a *codex integer* which is now lost? Reis apparently accepts the view of Stroux that we have two recensions, and that while the *mutilus* belongs to the better tradition, the *Laudensis* is a better representative of its (inferior) original.

An examination of the divergent readings found in some twenty pages of text where the editors disagree will illustrate the character of the two families and at the same time show in what a small circle much of the recension revolves (A = Avranches; L = *Laudensis*; Rs = Reis; Hdg = Heerdegen; Ma = Martha, the editor in the Budé series).

- 31. 6 *liquitur* Rs A *labitur* Hdg Ma *loquitur* L
- 31. 7 *mutata* Rs A *immutata* L Hdg Ma
- 31. 20 *vocant* Rs L Hdg *vocat* A Ma
- 32. 11 *dicentur* Rs A Hdg *dicuntur* L Ma
- 33. 18 *studuit* Rs A Ma *etudet* L Hdg
- 35. 10 *ut* Rs L *et* A Hdg *etiam* Ma Stroux
 sumus Rs L *sumus* A Hdg Ma
- 35. 22 *nos* Rs L Ma *nos* *minus* A *nos* *non* *minus* Hdg

38. 16 *quasi* Rs L Hdg *ea* A Ma
videmur Rs L Hdg *videamur* A Ma

38. 19 *tantum* Rs CODD. INTERP. *tamen* A Hdg Ma *solum* L

39. 16 *ego* Rs A Hdg *ergo* L Ma
dicantur Rs A Ma *dicentur* L Hdg

40. 1 *quod* Rs A *de quo* L Hdg *quo de* Ma
 10 *neque* Rs A Ma *neque* L Hdg
 22 *more* Rs A Hdg *morte* L Ma

40. 24 *officio* Rs L Hdg *officiis* A Ma

41. 12 *cumque* Rs L Hdg *cum* A Ma

43. 21 *eius omnis* Rs A Ma *omnis eius* L Hdg

44. 11 *uti de* Rs Stangl *ut de* L Hdg Ma *ut inde* A
 23 *duae res . . . tractatae* Rs A *duo . . . tractata* L Hdg Ma

45. 17 *enim ipsum* Rs L Hdg *ipsum* A Ma
non Rs L Hdg *om.* A Ma

46. 5 *extimescerem* Rs L Hdg *pertimescerem* A Ma
 20 *non requiratur* Rs L *ne requiratur* *quidem* A Hdg Ma
 22 *debeat esse* Rs L Ma *esse debeat* A Hdg

48. 13 *ecquid* Rs A *quid* L Hdg Ma

49. 20 *laudum mearum* Rs A Ma *mearam laudum* L Hdg

50. 27 *sese* Rs A *se* L Hdg Ma

While Reis in a number of cases defends the readings of the MSS against the emendations of his predecessors, he has introduced into the text numerous new emendations made chiefly by himself or by Stroux. Most of these may be acknowledged plausible.

Both volumes are provided with an Index nominum et rerum.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Horati Carmina viginti. Restituit emendavitve A. Y. CAMPBELL. E Prelo Academico Lerpulensi. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1934. Pp. vii+52. 5s.

This edition of twenty of Horace's *Odes* is called by Professor Campbell in his Introduction the fruit of his earlier book, *Horace: A New Interpretation*. In my review of that volume (*Class. Phil.*, XX [1925], 73-75) I expressed a wish that the writer should embody his exegesis in an edition of Horace. Perhaps this small volume will prove a forecast of such a work.

The quotation on the title-page, *Series iuncturaque pollet*, is an appropriate motto for the rearrangements and emendations of the text. The twenty selected *Odes* (i. 5, 6, 12, 20, 24, 32, 34; ii. 1, 20; iii. 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, 26; iv. 2, 10) are restored or emended to make them conform more completely to the norm for a Horatian ode posited in the "New Interpretation." In the Preface the editor replies to Mr. Glover's criticism of that norm thus:

De norma ibi posita quod percontatus est nuper dum comiter commendat amicus T. R. Glover, *Horace: A Return to Allegiance*, p. 70: "Isn't all such analysis a little like Olivia's account of herself in *Twelfth Night*?"—responsio est non. praescriptio illa Oliviana lepida et urbana est; nostra aut utilis aut praevissime nugatoria; documentum erit hic libellus.

The *libellus* in its beautiful format and pellucid Latinity (the Introduction and notes are in Latin) is as stimulating as Mr. Campbell's previous work because it is provocative of admiration for his ingenious reconstructions and of sharp disagreement with certain of his conclusions. Conservative students of the text will regret a revival of Peerlkamp's method of alteration on the basis of subjective criticism, but every student of Horace will be interested in the character of the changes proposed and the line of argument.

The alterations in general consist in changes in arrangement of strophes (in i. 6 the first and fourth are exchanged, in i. 24 the first and second, in iv. 2, ll. 49-52 are placed after l. 44) and in combinations of Odes (i. 34 and 35 are united in order to make possible an allegorical interpretation of 34, iii. 2 and 3, iii. 4 and 5, and, more surprising, ii. 15 and iii. 6 on the basis of *norma illa* and to secure a stylistic feature of iteration, commended as Horatian by Housman).

Changes in the manuscript readings of words often seem to dim a bright original by substituting an ordinary expression for poetic daring: in i. 12. 36, *nexus* for *letum*; in i. 20. 10, *pices* for *bibes*; in i. 34. 33, *artat* for *anteit*; and in i. 34. 40, *manicata* for *inimica*. In ii. 1 there is an amusing and rhetorical argument for substituting *equitesque volvi* for *equitumque voltus* in line 20, and very convincing reasoning for the change from *audire* to *haurire* in line 21. Other entertaining illustrations of subjective criticism are on ii. 20. 19, *politus* for *peritus*, "peritus Rhodani potor mihi quidem res comica videtur"; on iii. 2. 66, *noscere* for *discere*, "porro ad dignitatem Romuli pertinet *noscere*, non *discere*"; and on iv. 2. 45, *Virque* for *teque*, "Vir: ita, credo, Augustum significantius nuncupabant, ut nunc Mussolinium 'Il Duce.'" Several textual changes in iii. 26 are justified by a sprightly and charming verse translation entitled "At His Mistress, upon Her Requirement of Fidelity."

In spite of disagreement with most of Mr. Campbell's permutations and conjectures, I think that his edition should be in every university library, and that it will be valuable for seminars in textual criticism of Horace for its challenge to reconsideration of old interpretations. Mr. Campbell's ideas are always such a stimulus to retort that we envy his colleague, Mr. Mountford, his opportunity for that *viva voce* discussion which Mr. Campbell in his Preface commemorates so urbanely: "gratias ago conlegae J. F. Mountford opusculum plagulasque perlegenti, varia monenti non indocilem, quodque hodie rarius est, multa in conloquiis otiose de huiusmodi rebus disputanti."

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT

VASSAR COLLEGE

Die Niobe des Aischylos. Von WOLFGANG SCHADEWALDT. ("Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse" [1933-34], 3. Abhandlung.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934. Pp. 32. M. 1.50.

S. will 3 Fragen der Interpretation beantworten: (1) Wer ist der Sprecher? (2) Stellt das Fragment eine zusammenhängende Rede dar? (3) Was ergibt es für die Rekonstruktion des Dramas? Zunächst Text mit vollständigem Apparat und eingehenden Einzelerklärungen. Hauptergebnisse der folgenden Interpretation: (1) Die Sprecherin ist eine Vertraute der Niobe. (2) Die Verse 10-13 bilden eine Zwischenrede des Chors. (3) Für die Handlungsstrecke, während welcher Niobe schweigt, gewinnen wir nach der Parodos und vor dem Tantalosauftakt sicher einen Auftritt zwischen der Vertrauten und dem Chor. (4) Als Ort der Handlung ist Theben so gut wie sicher. (5) Wahrscheinlich besteht der Chor aus lydischen Frauen im Gefolge des Tantalos. (6) Ohne Zweifel begann das Stück mit dem fertigen Bilde der auf dem Grabe sitzenden Niobe.

S. gibt uns die interessanteste und wertvollste der bisher erschienenen Behandlungen des Fragments. Ich habe keine Einwände, die ich erheben möchte. Nur sei mir die Bemerkung erlaubt, dass das uns erhaltenen Prometheusdrama, da es von vielen aus verschiedenen Gründen für später überarbeitet oder sogar unecht gehalten worden ist, nur mit Vorsicht als Quelle für Belege aischyleischen Stils benutzt werden kann.

Druckfehler: S. 5, Zeile 7 von unten, *für οὐδὲν' lese man οὐδέν'*.

E. G. O'NEILL

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry. By ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1934. Pp. 291.

The posthumous publication of Professor Wheeler's Sather Lectures confirms the general opinion of his sober and accurate scholarship. Doubtless the lecturer shrank from popularizing philology, and, as he admits in his Preface, the lectures reveal more of the machinery of scholarship than such popularization usually exhibits. The book reads very much like a carefully digested summary of the results of investigation in a classical seminar. Instead of concentrating on Catullus' personality and his poetic art, the chapters deal mainly with the history of the literary types represented in the poet's work. As such the book is of value mainly to the advanced student of literary history, who welcomes the views of a sober scholar regarding the relations of the Roman poet to his Greek background.

H. W. P.

Ausgewählte Schriften. Von EDUARD WÖLFFLIN. Herausgegeben von DR. GUSTAF MEYER. Leipzig, 1933. Pp. xi+352. RM. 15.

This volume is an outgrowth of the celebration at Munich of the hundredth anniversary of Wölfflin's birth, an occasion which was marked by the opening of the splendid new quarters in the Maximilianeum of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Wölfflin's greatest achievement.

The selections are well chosen to illustrate Wölfflin's philological method. The first article, "Livianische Kritik und Livianischer Sprachgebrauch" (Program, 1864), is devoted to a critical discussion of a large number of disputed readings in the text of Livy. The evidence is derived from parallel passages: "Wir wollten den Livius aus sich selbst erklären, nicht aus den Eigentümlichkeiten der griechischen Sprache oder den stilistischen Freiheiten lateinischer Dichter." Incidentally Wölfflin shows that Livy's style had not yet become fixed in the first ten books of the history. In the second selection, the famous *Jahresberichte* on Tacitus (*Philologus*, Vols. XXV-XXVII [1867-69]), the same method is applied in a more extensive way to the works of Tacitus, to illustrate the genetic development of the style of that author in his successive works. Wölfflin breaks new ground in a much-neglected field in the third selection, "Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein" (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV [1874]). He discusses the sources of our knowledge of Vulgar Latin and makes stimulating observations on its word-formation. The fourth selection is the most important in the volume, "Lateinische und romanische Komparation" (1879); it remains the best discussion of the subject. In it Wölfflin suggests the compilation of a scientific lexicon of the Latin language and offers a treatise as a *Vorarbeit* and *Wegweiser* for the great undertaking. The fifth contribution, "Über die Latinität des Africanus Cassius Felix" (*Szb. d. k. bayr. Akad.* [1880]), has an antiquarian interest in connection with the myth of "African Latin," though it is an excellent example of Wölfflin's *Kleinarbeit* on the language and style of a Latin author. The last two articles, "Zur Alliteration" (*ibid.* [1881] and *Mélanges Boissier* [1903]) and "Die Gemination im Lateinischen" (*Szb. d. k. Bayr. Akad.* [1882]), contain an extraordinary collection of material, not only from Latin and the Romance languages, but from other languages as well, ranging from Sanskrit to modern German.

The selections are followed by two addresses delivered at the anniversary celebration: one by Stroux, who gives a sympathetic estimate of Wölfflin as a philologist, the other by Ditmann, who sketches the history of the movement to compile a *Thesaurus*, in which Wölfflin is the predominant figure. The volume is provided with a *Wort- und Sachregister* and a *Stellenregister*. The reproduction of a bronze relief portrait of Wölfflin, an excellent likeness, serves as frontispiece.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy. By R. S. CONWAY, J. WHATMOUGH, and S. E. JOHNSON. Published under the auspices of Harvard University and of the British Academy. Harvard University Press, 1933. 3 vols. Pp. 459, 632, and 163.

Some twenty-five years ago the late Professor Conway planned to complement his *Italic Dialects* by *Prae-Italic Dialects*, and made his main collation of the Venetic inscriptions. Despite the delays and vicissitudes described in the Preface, he was fortunately able to see it virtually completed before his death—a monumental work in three volumes which does honor to him and his collaborators and to the institutions which made possible its publication. It would be difficult to name another book in any field of epigraphy in which the facts about the texts are given with such painstaking fulness and accuracy. Throughout the work the emphasis is on assuring a dependable record as fundamental to any discussion of the linguistic problems, and the latter are dealt with only briefly. The fact is that of the hundreds of inscriptions only a few contain more than one line and these are not intelligible. Such matters of phonology and morphology as are at all certain, even for Venetic and Messapic, the relatively best known of the languages represented, do not make a long story.

Volume I contains the Venetic inscriptions, with a brief outline of Venetic grammar, by Professor Conway, and the "Ancient Names, Local, Divine, and Personal, of North Italy," by Mr. Johnson, with those of the Raeti by Professor Whatmough. On the much-discussed question of the significance of the puncta in the Venetic inscriptions, Professor Conway has thought best to state his own view dogmatically, namely, that they indicate word-accent (for the reviewer not at all convincing), and does not even give references to the other discussions. The view of Sommer that *h* is not always *h*, but also *i* with puncta and so to be read in the genitive and dative forms, is alluded to in a footnote, but not discussed or even stated.

Volume II, by Professor Whatmough, contains the Raetic, Lepontic (or Kelto-Liguric), East-Italic, Messapic, and Sicel inscriptions, with the glosses in ancient writers and the local and divine names of ancient Sicily, together with commentary, grammar, glossary, and an account of the alphabets. It is especially gratifying to have this hitherto much-scattered material together in one volume and in trustworthy form. The chapter on the alphabets gives what seem to be sound conclusions as to their relationship, and is of especial interest to those who are convinced that the source of the Germanic runes is to be found in the "Sub-Alpine" group of alphabets.

Volume III contains the indexes.

CARL D. BUCK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALEXANDER, WILLIAM HARDY. *Notes and Emendations to the XII Dialogues of L. Annaeus Seneca.* ("Publications of the University of Alberta.") Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1934. Pp. 33.

BALSDON, J. P. V. D. *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula).* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xix+243. \$3.50.

BARRACLOUGH, GEOFFREY. *Public Notaries and the Papal Curia: A Calendar and a Study of a Formularium notariorum curie from the Early Years of the Fourteenth Century.* London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1934. Pp. x+283.

BREITENBACH, WILHELM. *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik.* ("Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft," Heft 20.) Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. xviii+293. M. 21.

BROWN, RUTH MARTIN. *A Study of the Scipionic Circle.* Dissertation. ("Iowa Studies in Classical Philology," No. 1.) Scottsdale, Pa.: Mennonite Press, 1934. Pp. 95. \$1.00.

BURCK, ERICH. *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius.* ("Problemata: Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie," Heft 11.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Pp. viii+244. RM. 16.

Charisteria Gustavo Przychocki a Discipulis Oblata. Varsoviae: Gebethner et Wolff, 1934. Pp. xiv+363. \$1.90.

COLSON, F. H., and WHITAKER, G. H. *Philo*, Vol. V. With an English translation. ("Loeb Classical Library.") New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1934. Pp. vi+626+8. Cloth 10s.; leather 12s. 6d. net.

DIETERICH, HERMANN, and HILLER, FRIEDRICH VON. *Usener und Wilamowitz: Ein Briefwechsel, 1870-1905.* Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. 70. Kartonierte RM. 3.60.

DILLER, HANS. *Wanderarzt und Aitiologe. Studien zur Hippokratischen Schrift ΗΕΡΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ ΤΑΑΤΩΝ ΤΟΙΩΝ.* ("Philologus," Supplementband XXVI, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Pp. viii+120. M. 7.80; geb. M. 9.

DREXLER, HANS. *Die Komposition von Terenz' "Adelphien" und Plautus' "Rudens."* ("Philologus," Supplementband XXVI, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Pp. 114. M. 6.70; geb. M. 8.

DÜRING, INGEMAR. *Ptolemaios und Porphyrios über die Musik.* ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," XL (1934), 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1934. Pp. 293. Kr. 10.

HAFFTER, HEINZ. *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache.* ("Problemata: Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie," Heft 10.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Pp. 153. RM. 10.

HARDER, RICHARD. *Platos "Kriton."* Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Pp. 73. RM. 2; geb. RM. 2.80.

"Harvard Studies in Classical Philology," Vol. XLV. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. 263.

HAWES, ADELINE BELLE. *Citizens of Long Ago: Essays on Life and Letters in the Roman Empire.* New York, London, Toronto, Melbourne, and Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. vii+183. \$2.50.

HENNIG, R. *Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos: Eine Studie über die Erdkundlichen Elemente der "Odyssee."* ("Neue Wege zur Antike," I. Reihe: "Darstellungen," Heft 10.) Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. vi+101. RM. 4.80.

KAHRSTEDT, ULRICH. *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*. (Göttinger Forschungen," Heft 4.) Stuttgart und Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. iv + 370. M. 24.

LEWIS, N. *L'industrie du papyrus dans l'Egypte gréco-romaine*. Paris: L. Rodstein, 1934. Pp. xiii + 186. Fr. 25.

LOCKWOOD, DEAN PUTNAM. *A Survey of Classical Roman Literature*, Vol. I. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934. Pp. xvi + 334. \$2.50.

MARCHEZINI, MARIA. *Omero. L'“Iliade” e l'“Odissea”*: Due saggi critici. ("Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna.") Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1934. Pp. xi + 138. L. 10.

MERRITT, BENJAMIN DEAN, and WEST, ALLEN BROWN. *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.* ("University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series," Vol. XXXIII.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934. Pp. xiv + 112. Figs. 17; pls. 2.

MNEMOSYNE: *Bibliotheca Classica Batava*, Ser. III, Vol. I, Fasc. 1. Lugduni-Batavorum: E. J. Brill, 1933-34. Pp. 80.

MOORE, R. W. *Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax*. London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1934. Pp. xii + 224. 6/-.

The Pharos of Alexandria: Summary of an Essay in Spanish by Don Miguel de Asin. Communicated by the DUKE OF ALBA. (From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. XIX.) London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, E.C., 1934. Pp. 18; pls. 4. \$1.00.

SAUTER, FRANZ. *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*. ("Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft.") Stuttgart und Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. ix + 178. M. 9.

SELIGSOHN, RUDOLF. *Die Übersetzung der ps.-Aristotelischen Problematen durch Bartholomaeus von Messina: Text und leztkritische Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch*. Dissertation. Berlin: Dr. Emil Ebering, 1934. Pp. 164.

SHAW, T. E. *The "Odyssey" of Homer: Newly Translated into English Prose*. New York: Oxford University Press, Popular Impression, 1934. Pp. 327. \$1.35.

SNELL, B. (ed.). *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*. Post FRIDERICUM BLASS et GUILLEMUM SUESS. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1934. Pp. 55* + 153. RM. 5.20; geb. RM. 6.20.

STETTNER, WALTER. *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* ("Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft," Heft XXII.) Stuttgart und Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. viii + 92. M. 5.40.

ΣΤΚΟΤΡΗ, Ι. ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΣΤΜΠΙΟΣΙΩΝ: Κείμενον, μετάφρασις καὶ ἐρμηνεία. ΑΘΗΝΑΙ, ΕΚΔΟΤΑΙ: ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ Δ. ΚΟΛΑΡΟΣ & ΣΙΑ, 1934. Pp. 254* + 239.

TAYLOR, A. E. *The "Parmenides" of Plato: Translated into English with Introduction and Appendixes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. 161. \$2.75.

UNTERSTEINER, MARIO. *Sofocle. Aiace: Introduzione e commento*. Milano: Carlo Signorelli, Editore, 1934. Pp. 321. L. 10.

WALDE, ALOIS. *lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage, von J. B. HOFMANN. 7. Lieferung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934. Pp. 481-560.

WELLMANN, MAX. *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos*. ("Philologus," Supplementband XXVII, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Pp. 50. M. 4.50.

"Yale Classical Studies," Vol. IV. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. Pp. 234. \$2.50.

The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1933. Bristol and London: J. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd., 1933. Pp. xi + 106. 3/6 net.

